The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1930 NUMBER 828

Contents

The Week 216

Editorials

Hoover Looks Forward 218
1930: The Dilemma of the Progressive 220

General Articles

"Equal Protection of the Law" ..... Mathew O. Tobriner 222
The Russian Bear in the Wheat Pit ..... Vera Micheles Dean 224
New York City: Corruption As Usual ..... Joseph McGoldrick 226
Good News from Wisconsin ..... Lyle D. Cooper 228
The Detection of Journalistic Bias ..... Hornell Hart, Susan Kingsbury and Associates 230
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 233
A Vase for Telemachus ..... Vincent Sheean 234

Correspondence 235

Reviews of Books

Gothic Magnificence ..... Robert Morss Lovett 236
The Cycle of Lord Chelsea ..... John Chamberlain 237
Ford Was Right ..... Murray Godwin 237
A New History of Science ..... Hyman Rosen 238
"God Help Me to Be Better" ..... Slater Brown 239
A Mistress of Vision ..... Morton Dauwen Zabel 240
Notes on Novels 241

The Week

WHILE the Hoover administration is entitled to a suspension of judgment until all the evidence is in, the charges of Mr. Ralph S. Kelley regarding the oil-shale land in western Colorado look increasingly serious. They are directed, of course, not only against Secretary Wilbur but his predecessors in office, and particularly against Dr. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior from 1923 to the middle of 1928, and Mr. Hoover's choice for chairman of the Republican National Committee during the presidential campaign. Mr. Kelley is telling his story in a series of articles in The New York World. He charges that Secretary Wilbur has already permitted the alienation to the oil companies of 35,000 acres of land containing oil with a potential value of $1,750,000,000, and that Secretary Work took similar action which cost the United States $20,000,000,000. In both cases, the issue was the validity of mining claims made prior to the new law of 1920. The question was whether the claimants had complied with the government requirements that minerals should have been actually discovered on the claim and assessment work done thereafter to a value of $100 a year.

MR. KELLEY says that Secretary Work obeyed the wishes of the big oil companies by postponing all other suits rising out of oil-land claims until after one of them, the Krushnic case, had been settled. This very delay, of two years and four days, was then used by the oil companies as a reason why their leases should be validated, and Mr. Kelley says that the Secretary (by this time it was Dr. Wilbur) yielded to their demands. This, however, Secretary Wilbur has already denied, stating that he is attempting to recover title in every case where there is any hope of doing so. Dr. Wilbur has been severely criticized for his actions after the Kelley charges were first made public, in that he began by announcing that the Department of the Interior would investigate itself, and only turned the case over to the Department of Justice after protests had been made in the press. His course could, however, be explained as the ineptitude of inexperience, since he is new to public life. In any case, the Department of Justice will continue its investigation and the United States Congress will conduct an inquiry if it seems desirable.

TWO grand guesses were made last week at the amount of liquor now being consumed in these thirsty states. Rival corps of statisticians in the employ of the United States government and the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment have been racing for months to get their figures out first, and the Association's men won by forty-eight hours. For the convenience of our readers we have soberly put the two estimates together into a single table which we present below:

GUESSES AS TO PRESENT ANNUAL CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

	THE GOVERNMENT'S GUESS	THE WETS' GUESS
Wine	118,000,000 gals.	110,000,000 gals.
Beer	700,000,000 "	790,000,000 "
Spirits	73,000,000 "	200,000,000 "

It will be seen that these estimates are surprisingly similar as to wine and beer, the government figures

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as to the former being 7.2 percent larger than those of the Wets, and on beer, 12.8 percent smaller. The only serious disagreement has to do with hard liquor, the Wet's estimate being nearly three times that of Mr. Amos W. W. Woodcock's bright little calculators.

NATURALLY, the compilers of the two documents emphasize different aspects of the picture. The Wets say that we are spending $2,848,000,000 a year for drink, whereas in 1913, one of the biggest pre-prohibition years, we spent only $1,817,000,000. Since 1913, of course, the population has grown and the currency has depreciated in purchasing power. The experts of the association presumably take these factors into consideration, for they announce that if prohibition did not exist, we ought now to be spending $2,500,000,000 a year. They see an excess expenditure of $348,000,000, to be accounted for either by increased consumption or higher prices or both. Mr. Woodcock, on the other hand, feels bound to take a more cheerful view. He concerns himself not with what we spend for liquor but the quantity which goes down our throats. As will be seen from the table, he estimates this at a little less than 900,000,000 gallons, or about seven for every man, woman and child in the country. He compares this with 1914, when the per-capita consumption was nearly twenty-three gallons, and says that we are drinking, at most, only 40 percent as much as before. Since bootleg beverages are slightly less potent than was the pre-war stuff, he thinks the consumption of alcohol is only 35 percent of that of 1914. It is perhaps unkind to point out to Mr. Woodcock that in 1919, just before the Volstead law went into effect, the consumption was only 9.28 gallons per capita. Fifty years earlier, when all kinds of drink were legal practically everywhere in America, the amount was about the same as his estimate for 1929-30.

THE important point, of course, is not the exact amount which is now being consumed, as to which nobody can do much better than to make a wild guess, but the conditions under which the traffic is going on and the consequences to our national life. This tremendous industry has not been halted but driven underground, where it is denied the protection of the law. It has therefore been forced to invent its own law. It has bribed many thousands of federal, state and municipal officials; it has raised its own private armies of gangsters, utterly indifferent to human life, and it fights off the pirates who prey upon the trade in battles which, in the city of Chicago alone, have cost more than five hundred lives in a decade. But this is only half of the picture. Hundreds of thousands of otherwise law-abiding and respectable citizens habitually and casually violate the Eighteenth Amendment, and bring up their children to see the law thus flouted. Such conditions would be extremely serious even if it could be demonstrated that the consumption of liquor has been reduced nine-tenths.

ATTORNEY General Mitchell has made an official ruling which, if sustained, will have a disastrous effect upon the activities of the Federal Power Commission. He did so in the case of the Appalachian Power Company, a subsidiary of the Electric Bond and Share Company, which applied for permission to build an 80,000-horsepower project on the New River in West Virginia. In essence, the new ruling says that if a stream is not navigable at the point where the power is developed, though it may be navigable at a lower point, the Federal Power Commission loses its right to supervise the issuance of stock in the hydro-electric power company, and thereby is prevented from regulating rates charged for power. If the prospective lessee agrees not to interfere with the water supply in such a way as to affect navigation, the Power Commission can waive all its rights except that which requires recapture of the plant by the government at the end of fifty years. It is obvious that this decision opens the door to almost unlimited looting by the power interests, since most large power projects are located at unnavigable points, unless the gap is stopped through additional legislation in the next session of Congress.

NEW YORK theater-goers are benefiting at present from a war among the managers. The newly formed theater league, which agrees to keep some orchestra seats in the box office and to hold brokers to a charge of seventy-five cents a ticket, is being opposed by a few managers who remain outside the fold. One of them announces that *all* seats will be sold through the box office, at no advance whatever; another has persuaded a group of "outlaw" brokers to handle his tickets at the old-fashioned advance of fifty cents each. Several managers have reduced their prices, in some cases hastily raising them again as soon as public response demonstrated that they had a hit. Most charming of all we find the attitude of Mr. George White, revue impresario, who advertises that if your ticket agency refuses to sell you seats for his show, he will condescend to do so, at box-office rates. Mr. White evidently thinks people go to the agencies for the sheer pleasure of throwing away $1.50 or more. Hard times in the theater no doubt account for the unexpected amiability of the managers, and no one can predict how long the present state of affairs will go on. It has lasted long enough to justify the inquiry: Why couldn't they have done it years and years ago?

IN A recent dispatch from London we learn that their Majesties have just ordered five twelve-cylinder Daimlers. They have bought these cars, not because they need them, but purely for the purpose, according to Buckingham Palace author-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ities, "of helping by their example to relieve unemployment during the winter months." It is indeed gratifying to learn that their Majesties have come through so splendidly in their efforts to grapple with the unemployment situation. For if their subjects are capable of so regal a gesture of self-sacrifice, and if every Englishman will buy five twelve-cylinder Daimlers for himself and his wife, there is not the slightest doubt that the unemployment problem will be solved not only "during the winter months," but for all time. However, one thing troubles us. If the idea is accepted, won't the King have a terrible traffic problem on his hands?

IT IS a curious and quite illogical coincidence that those who last year were most loudly declaiming against the tendency of American crowds to heap themselves up in baseball fields and football stadiums should this year be the most violent in ridicule of miniature golf. Here at last—though they do not seem to realize the fact—is the all-inclusive sport whose lack they have been deploring. Football, hockey and boxing are primarily sports for the onlooker; the players have come to regard them all as a sad business that yields its returns in cash or in bids to fraternities. Sand-lot baseball has gone the way of the sand lots which nurtured it. Tennis and golf are expensive: they require special costumes which appeal to the universal instinct for dressing up, but which put them beyond the purses of the crowd. On the other hand, almost any one can afford the quarter, the twenty-five cents, the fourth part of a dollar, which is charged for a round of miniature golf. The young people play it together, instead of holding hands in the movies or yawning together before the radio. The drug-store cowboys have left the corner drug store; they are down at Jimmie's golf course watching the girls drive the pill through the sewer pipe, across the water hazard and into the flower pot for a neat seventeen (par for the hole being three). And the tired motorist on Sundays has found a place to linger; he need not continue aimlessly down a ribbon of concrete, always fleeing the boredom that follows his rear wheels like a traffic cop.

OF ALL the tales of misery and pain which our daily papers have recently recorded, not one for bleak, unmitigated tragedy can touch the story of Alwin Krammer. He is a German sailor who for the past four months has been a member of the anonymous throng that tramps the streets of New York looking for work. During these four hard months Krammer's savings slowly dwindled until early last week he found that he had only a few dollars left. It was then he decided that come what might, and even at the price of hunger, he would buy himself a new pair of shoes. One can readily understand his profoundly human motives, for there is something about a pair of new shoes that buoys up one's spirits, restores one's self-esteem. To the legion of Krammer's roofless brothers, good shoes of necessity are a symbol of well-being, of security and at least of hope. So Krammer bought his new shoes and with this simple act set the wheels of his own tragedy in motion. For first of all it turned out that his new shoes were much too small for him. They chafed and pinched his feet. Being penniless, he wandered into Central Park where he could rest a little. It was already evening. Krammer to relieve his aching feet removed his shoes, placed them beside him for safe keeping and lay down on the bench to sleep. Several hours later he awoke. The new shoes were gone. Krammer rose dazed and for an hour or so wandered about the city streets in his stocking feet feeling, one can readily believe, that a whole savage, leering world had closed in upon him. Finally, unable to bear up against it any longer, Krammer in a burst of what one dares hardly call insane despair, flung himself into the path of an oncoming trolley car. The trolley stopped in time and he was dragged from the tracks. He resisted, tried to fling himself under the trolley again and was finally carried off to Bellevue "for observation." One cannot help wondering what this observation will reveal. Perhaps the pyschiatrists at Bellevue will discover that unemployment is not good for a man's mind.

Hoover Looks Forward

IN FOUR speeches within a week President Hoover has endeavored to hearten the American people in the midst of economic trials. He has spoken to them through the bankers and the trade unions, through the American Legion and a patriotic assemblage celebrating the Battle of King's Mountain. The messages differ in detail but not in temper; through them all runs a single theme. That theme is an invocation to American tradition and to American material achievements as an antidote to pessimism about the future of income and employment.

A too cynical commentator might see in this broadcast nothing more than a rather disreputable political device. It comes scarcely a month before the elections; unrest due to the depression, which in other nations has expressed itself in violent political overturns, may here be shown in a preference for Democratic Tweedledees over Republican Tweedledums. The predicted autumn upturn in production, employment and stock prices has, like the predicted revival last spring, failed to appear. Discontent with business conditions is the opposition's stock in trade. Though the administration cannot argue that prosperity is here, it can possibly create a revulsion against the critics by making it seem unpatriotic to call attention to the industrial crisis. If it can convince the electorate that dwelling on the dark areas is pessimism, and that pessimism both retards recovery and is out of tune with the American spirit, it may escape the conse-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quences of popular discouragement. Having so long subsisted on the credit for creating prosperity, the Republican party is now trying to dodge the blame for having failed to maintain it.

But while this interpretation of Mr. Hoover's words is doubtless part of the truth, it is by no means the whole truth. His accent is that of sincerity, and what he now says is too much like what he said before the depression to be pushed aside as a mere trumped-up attitude. His message deserves to be examined on its own merits as a confession of faith.

What is this faith? It consists of an assertion that the historic development of the United States is, on the whole, a progress in the right direction, that it will triumphantly arrive at its goal, that our misfortunes are either accidental or due to the failure to live up to the best of our own traditions. The preservation of those traditions unsullied by alien modes is more important than the trial of new plans. "Our problems are the problems of growth. They are not the problems of decay." "The fundamental assets of the nation, the education, intelligence, virility and the spiritual strength of our 120,000,000 people, have been unimpaired." "We know, in fact, that we have opened the door of a new social and economic system by which within our own borders we shall create the conquest of poverty. . . ." "I remain an unquenchable believer in the resistless, dynamic power of American enterprise . . . we have known a thousand temporary setbacks, but the spirit of this people will never brook defeat."

Mr. Hoover's conception of the peculiar American system locates its origin not merely in the rich natural resources of the continent, but in "ideas and ideals which liberated the mind and stimulated the exertion of a people." These ideas are the familiar ones associated with equality and freedom under the law—particularly equality of opportunity to get ahead and accumulate wealth. They imply constitutional, representative government, free and universal education, the absence of castes and rigid classes. This system cannot be well defined. "Some have called it individualism, but it is not an individualism which permits men to override the equal opportunity of others. By its enemies it has been called capitalism, and yet under its ideals capital is but an instrument, not a master."

This ideal picture is utilized, not wholly to deny the misery and injustices which now exist, but to soften their edges and to point out the ways by which the President believes they may be overcome. The government is regarded as a minor factor in the great endeavor to abolish poverty, except as it may be used to uphold the Constitution, enforce the law, act as umpire and perhaps furnish a little leadership now and then. Strangely enough, though he praises our government as representative and democratic, Mr. Hoover seems to regard most of the positive activities it might undertake as the intrusion of an alien sovereignty rather than the coöperative action of a people. Voluntary endeavor and adjustment among mainly non-governmental groups are the forces which he invokes. Action to relieve unemployment is typified by the movement undertaken by railroads, utilities and industries to increase their construction work, at the administration's request. He says nothing of public labor exchanges or unemployment insurance, but he does hint that some restrictive clause in the Transportation Act may have hindered the railroads from doing all they might. This depression is to be outlived and future depressions minimized by means of intelligent control of credit exercised by bankers and good influence exerted by them over business. Stability is to be sought and the abolition of poverty approached by the selfsame method which, a year or two ago, Mr. Hoover assumed was the guarantee of continued prosperity—coöperation of management and labor to increase production and distribute the benefits equitably to capital, worker and consumer. He naïvely asserts that we have already learned how to make such equitable distribution. The coal industry is a black spot in our economy, suffering from overcompetition—but the remedy lies in the abolition of governmental restriction on combination. In all this there is not an economic idea which had not been entertained by the President before the possibility of another such long continued and severe depression as this had been suspected.

We do not underestimate the power of the original American faith, or the helpfulness of certain measures advocated by the President. But it is disturbing that at the present juncture he should be so well content with an assertion of old ideals, while exhibiting so little concern over the extreme imperfection with which they have been brought to life by the methods which meet with his approval. It would have been more significant if he had said, not that capital is an instrument of social amelioration, but that it ought to be. One who is both deeply concerned over equality of opportunity and aware of existing facts should have said less, it would seem, about the existence of opportunity to rise to leadership, and more about the lack of opportunity of the millions of unemployed to eat. He would have marveled, not that we have done so much better than other nations in the advance of material welfare over a period of years, but that with our energy, character and equipment we had not done more to raise the depressed living standards and prevent unplanned economic spasms. The self-satisfied industrial leadership of America will not move rapidly in the desired direction as the result of calm reassurance and few gentle hints; it needs the spur and the rowel.

It will be objected that this is not the time to say anything which might arouse fear or antagonism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What industry needs is confidence, not doubts. But according to the same authorities, prosperity also is not the time for change. Indeed, during prosperity, the need itself for any sort of change is denied. We give Mr. Hoover credit for wanting to develop a sort of coöperative, liberal capitalism which will justify American ideals. But his strategy in the endeavor seems to us extremely poor. It comes too close to believing that the assertion of an ideal is identical with its accomplishment. The look forward turns out to be really a look backward. The time was ripe for a ringing challenge to industry and finance to set its house in order. Now, if ever, was the occasion for the suggestion of new measures and comprehensive plans. So far as we can discover, Mr. Hoover has done nothing toward the creation of a permanent machinery or the framing of a rounded program to aid industrial stability—and in saying this we have in mind, not socialistic measures, which he could not be expected to approve, but something in the way of a voluntary economic general staff, which would have been adjusted to his temper. Approaching a winter of physical distress which will, without much question, be one of the worst the United States has ever known, Mr. Hoover has been content to burn incense before the altars of his ancestors.

1930: The Dilemma of the Progressive

THE POLITICAL campaign in New York state this year gives an excellent illustration of the problem by which the progressive-minded citizen finds himself confronted, almost everywhere in the country, when he seeks to exercise the franchise as intelligently and usefully as he can. For some time, it seemed likely that prohibition might be the overshadowing issue in New York; but this is no longer true. Both of the major parties and their gubernatorial candidates, Governor Roosevelt for the Democrats and Mr. Tuttle for the Republicans, have gone Wet. While their platforms on this subject are not identical, they might as well be. We are back, therefore, where we started. How should the independent good citizen of New York state cast his vote—if at all?

Governor Roosevelt has made an excellent record for himself during his comparatively brief career in public life. His attitude on social-welfare legislation, and on state control of public utilities, including power, would commend him at least to those of our readers who agree with the editorial policies of The New Republic. Yet he can hold office only with the approval of Tammany Hall, an organization, which as most people knew and as recent events have amply demonstrated for those few who didn't, stands for corruption as the normal course of procedure in municipal government. The Governor's reluctance to see a thorough investigation of the New York City scandals, his half-hearted plea that city officials should waive immunity and testify before the Grand Jury, but only in regard to their official acts, show how grave are the handicaps which the indissoluble alliance with Tammany puts upon him. No doubt there will be some progressives who will feel that the Governor's general social program outweighs the link with Tammany, and will point out that Al Smith, who was himself a cub of the Tiger as Roosevelt is not, gave the state the best and most liberal administration it has ever had. For many more, however, who feel that Smith would have acted vigorously and promptly to end the scandals, as Roosevelt has not done, the present Governor will be an undesirable candidate.

Mr. Tuttle is a man with some admirable qualities, and on the whole a better candidate than the Republicans have any right to expect. He is, however, tied to a machine which is no more desirable than that of the Democrats. In New York City, the Republican bosses play the same game as Tammany, and usually under a secret agreement for a modest share of the loot. Throughout the state, the party is in league with the most reactionary elements in the community, with open-shop employers and particularly with those public-utility magnates who seek to have the development of water power remain in private hands and be operated, not for the greatest benefit to the community, but for the largest possible private profit. It is difficult to see how any progressive could vote for Mr. Tuttle with a clear conscience, in view of the elements behind him.

At this juncture, it is time for the Socialists to come forward and observe that the dilemma is to be solved by casting your ballot for their gubernatorial candidate, Mr. Louis Waldman, and the rest of their ticket; and decidedly there is a a great deal to be said in favor of this contention. Under the leadership of men like Norman Thomas (who is this year running for Congress), the Socialist party in New York has paid little attention to dogmatic Marxian theory, and has made itself the gadfly of the two old-line parties, criticizing their acts while in office and their programs when out of it. The Socialists' charges would have been more effective if they had had funds with which to carry on a research of their own, and had not been so largely limited to repeating accusations which originated in other quarters. Nevertheless, they have done a good job, and some of their candidates have been men of the highest type—higher, probably, than could have been obtained if there had been any likelihood that they would be elected. There has, of course, been no such likelihood, and there is none now. In most parts of the state the party is only sketchily organized, and nowhere is it equipped to do the sort of campaigning which results in victory. A Socialist vote is a protest vote and no more. A good case may be made for a protest vote: for standing by your convictions regardless of the fact that there is for the present no hope of victory. But it must be recognized that such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an attitude is alien to the temper of the vast number of Americans. They want their ballots to count for something, not ten or twenty years hence, but immediately. They insist on voting for an inferior candidate who has a chance to win rather than a superior one who is foredoomed to defeat. The objection to the Socialists would also hold true if the progressives should prefer to put a third ticket of their own into the field, instead of enlisting under the former's banner—though the opportunistic character of the party in New York makes any such distinction unnecessary.

What we have, in short, is a dilemma for the progressive which is not unlike that confronting the man who seeks credit at the bank. Those who can get credit are those who don't need it; one who needs it is by that very fact debarred from getting it. The progressives cannot gain followers in large numbers until they have some chance of success; and they have no chance of success until they have followers! In New York in 1930, they must either make a protest which will hardly be counted as such, or shut their eyes to Tammany and vote for Roosevelt.

The experience of the British Labor party is often quoted as an example of what might be done in America. For many years the Labor party was no more than an educational institution. It stuck to its propaganda activities regardless of the number of its followers. When the time came for it to enter the political arena it had a large nucleus of steadfast supporters. But difficulties in the way of a repetition of British experience in the United States are obvious. The British Labor party was built, of course, around the trade-union movement; but in this country, with a few exceptions, the trade unions are supporters of the American Federation of Labor. The Federation of Labor still thinks in terms of the America of 1880; it is at present inflexibly conservative, opposed to political action on its own account, dominated by a leadership which could not achieve political victory, and would not know what to do with one. The American trade-union movement, moreover, does not at present show the vitality, the power to grow, which it would need in order to be the forcing ground for a new political movement.

If recent American political history has taught us anything at all, it is that no grouping of any significance can be created from on top. It must spring from a genuine belief on the part of an important group in the community that its interests demand unified political expression. That has been the cause of the successful progressivism of Wisconsin, and it was the secret of the Non-Partisan League in North Dakota and adjacent states. The Wisconsin progressives at the time the elder La Follette first emerged upon the scene found themselves remorselessly exploited by the railroads and other large corporations. The North Dakota farmers were also exploited, both by the railroads and by those who bought their products at dictated prices over which the farmer had no control. In both cases, however, there was a long process of education which preceded the organization of an effective political phalanx. The individual knew he had a grievance; but he had to be taught how he could use his strength at the ballot box to remedy the situation of which he complained.

It is clear, then, that what is needed in New York, and everywhere else, is first of all for the progressives to make a realistic analysis of the situation, find what elements in the community would be most benefited by a legislative program for social and economic amelioration and ask themselves candidly what hope there is of enrolling these groups within their own ranks. Once this is done, they should begin "from the grass roots up." Before attempting state or nation-wide organization, they should see whether they can agree with their neighbors as to what progressivism means and is today. They should then seek to form a local political organization which will have at least a chance of being locally effective. Nearly all the success which progressives have achieved in America in recent years has come as the result of a split in one or the other of the old parties, the progressives capturing the party machinery and winning local victories, not only because of their progressive principles but also because they had the machinery, plus the money, to stage an effective campaign.

It would be folly, however, to sit and wait for such splits to occur again; and in their absence, a new organization must be built up which will be equivalent to those which exist in the old parties, at least in these two essentials of machinery and finances. In the meantime, despite the temptations held out by such times as the present, with unemployment and unrest, the progressives must abandon hope of immediate political success. If their analysis of conditions has been correct and their spade work sound, the period of education will eventually flower into success as it did with the British Labor party and as it has occasionally done in Wisconsin and elsewhere, in this country. This is a long, hard road; but we are aware of no shorter one which does not lead to the dismal swamp of futility.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1930, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Equal Protection of the Law"

WHEN MY class entered Harvard Law School, it was invited to hear an esteemed practitioner lecture on the law. Being young, then, and enthusiastic, we turned out almost to a man, some of us even standing in the aisles of Holdsworth House. I shall never forget the chiseled features of the speaker's face. Its classic balance symbolized the harmony and smoothness of his legal system.

Legal rules, he said, were but an expression of basic principles of justice. These principles were as universal and all-powerful as the laws of nature. Like gravity, they operated indiscriminately, affecting rich and poor alike. Some of them had crystallized into statute, as, for instance, one of the greatest: "No state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law" (United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment). Thus the law did not heed people's purses. If a pauper carelessly stepped in front of a millionaire's machine and lost a leg, the victim's poverty did not win him judgment. Law was equality. Treating each litigant as equal in every respect to the other, searching for legal principle and carving it into law, the courts made possible the orderly running of society. They faced the problems created by society's frictions and resolved them by applying eternal principles of justice.

We came out of Holdsworth House into a clear black night. Solid rows of dormitories faced each other in the Yard. We could see the stars making their quiet way through the open spaces between the leaves of the elm trees. It was fine to know that the law judged men with the same impartiality with which nature moved the stars. It was fine to know that our life's work was to apply great principles to social disputes, and thereby facilitate the progress of an orderly society.

And though the words of the speaker dimmed after three years of law school, and though the principle that each person stood equal before the law blurred in classroom discussion, still one young lawyer left Harvard seeing the orderly stars of a quiet Yard. He did not know that three years before he had heard a lecture based on a Greek theory that had died before Rome, been reborn in feudal ages and been blown into chaos by the industrial revolution. Nor did he know that his quiet universe had exploded into a mass of comets, meteors and flying nebula that had no principles whatsoever.

I shall never forget the man who wanted to form a trade association of metal dealers to compete with a well financed national concern that was getting most of the business. The association aimed to fix uniform methods of sale and to prevent association members from underbidding each other—from cutting each other's throats until a ruinous sale to the national concern would be the only salvage. The single hope of the independents, my client explained, was coöperative effort.

I told him the law forbade such coöperative fixing of price (United States vs. Trenton Potteries Company, 273 U. S. 392). He said, "Well, the National does it. Look, the National fixes the prices of the metals sold by all the concerns which it's bought out. It owns over a hundred concerns. They sell at the same price. If they sell at a fixed price, why can't we?"

I explained that the concerns which the National owned were merged with it. Under the anti-trust laws, a merger was illegal only if it "unreasonably" restrained trade; that is, sold goods under bogus brands, attempted to ruin a competitor by price cutting or pursued other nefarious practices injurious to the public. But the law, not being affected by the size of a litigant's purse, did not render the merger illegal merely because of its bigness. It saw the merger as a single person, nothing more. On the other hand, it saw a trade association, which is not incorporated, as very many different persons. A number of persons cannot set prices without unreasonably restraining trade.

While it was true that a merger controlled not only the prices of the concerns it owned but also their marketing, merchandising and manufacturing processes, it was, in the eyes of the law, less dangerous and "reasonable" than a price agreement of two independent corner grocery stores.

"The law is cockeyed," said my metal man. And, try as I might, I could not convince him of the justice of the legal principle that price setting was bad no matter how small the price fixers or how powerless their association. He couldn't understand that each person was equal before the law, and equally protected by it, and that the law was totally uninterested in the economic strength of the merged National and the weakness of himself and his confederates. He didn't see why the "Rule of Reason" upheld the legality of mergers and yet forbade the association from price fixing, even though its prices were more reasonable than those of the merger. He couldn't see the justice of a law that denied him the use of the only economic instrument that could save him from extinction: coöperation. Nor did he understand that the law, being compelled to treat "big fellows" and "little fellows" alike, had to prevent little fellows from combining although it approved of big fellows getting bigger. He didn't realize that the little fellows were getting the full benefit of equal protection of law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not many months later an ex-classmate of mine excited my interest in the oil situation. His firm was counsel for one of the largest, if not the largest, oil company of the state. Alleging that this company was joining with gasoline dealers to set prices, and also that it was aiming to control production, the Federal Trade Commission had indicted it. If the allegations were true, the company seemed guilty of conspiring to restrain trade under the existing legal rules.

Yet the unwelcome truth proved that the United States was exhausting its oil reserves at a mad pace. It seemed that this country had contributed 7,905,929,000 barrels of the world's total production of 12,392,541,000 barrels between 1857 and 1924, nearly 65 percent. Although we had depleted but 40 percent of our total supply, the remainder would not last long at the present annual consumption rate of 766,000,000 barrels. Thus we were using our own resources in order to supply oil to the rest of a wiser oil-conserving world. And the government, through the agency of the law, was not only forbidding coöperation for the control of prices and production, but was compelling the exhaustion of the pools. It made hasty drainage by each individual producer necessary in order to forestall drainage by competitors. The oil producers themselves realized that their sole solution was coöperation. Only if the production of the various pools could be controlled could prices be stabilized and the present waste avoided. Yet the Attorney General of the United States had declared such limitation of production a violation of the anti-trust laws.

I had a vision of a fine-featured lawyer expounding the principle, eternal as the stars, that each person was equal before the law. Legal rules must surely be enforced with the cold impartiality of the law of gravitation. If price fixing is illegal, the economic predicament of a whole industry and the economic necessity of a country cannot legalize price fixing by oil producers. Oil producers are not to receive from the courts treatment different from that accorded any other persons, even if their situation is such as to demand it.

And yet my friend and I stumbled on dozens of legal decisions that had permitted price fixing by farmers. The courts had upheld coöperative marketing associations wherein farmers—thousands in a single association—had set the prices at which their produce sold. Here was a ruling somewhat difficult to fit into the principle of equal protection of law. Why was it "reasonable," as the courts said, to fix prices for farm products but not "reasonable" for oil producers to do so? One uninitiated into legal reasoning might conclude that it was very reasonable to conserve oil. Surely a metal producer might think it "reasonable" to permit small tradesmen to fix prices in competing with mergers. What was the quality that gained for farmers and mergers the benediction of legal "reasonableness" and denied it to oil men and trade associations?

While I was turning this over in my mind, I was confronted with still another problem. A trade union of lithographers in the city in which I was practising refused to work on metal produced at non-union shops. Throughout the city the union had been fighting to close down metal shops which worked during a longer day and for less wages than the union schedule. The lithographers argued that the only sure way to fix an eight-hour day and a decent wage scale for themselves was to see that the entire industry operated on such a basis, and they threatened to strike if compelled to work on metal produced at non-union shops.

Yet such a strike would probably have been illegal. In Duplex Printing Press Company vs. Deering, 254 U. S. 443, the United States Supreme Court held that truckmen could not refuse to transport non-union-made presses. It likewise held that a stonecutters' union could not object to working on stone produced at non-union shops.

On the other hand, manufacturers have the right to stop dealing with retailers who do not charge the price which the manufacturers set. They can arbitrarily refuse their labor (their products) to such customers. But laborers cannot arbitrarily agree to refuse their labor to producers who persist in using non-union goods. While a manufacturer need not deal with a retailer who sells below his price, a union cannot refuse to deal with that same manufacturer when he refuses to meet its demand that he use union products.

And the explanation of this conundrum is our old doctrine that each person is equal before the law. Legally, the manufacturer is a single person, no more powerful than a single laborer. He can refuse to deal with customers not following his price policies. But a laborer who, in combination with other laborers, refuses to work on non-union goods conspires to restrain trade. This is because two equal persons (two manufacturers or two laborers) are joining together to accomplish their purposes. Such coöperation in law is conspiracy.

Probably the manufacturing corporation has more than a million stockholders. Still, when it refuses to deal with buyers of its products, it does not conspire to restrain trade because it is, before the law, one person—equal in strength to one laborer, despite the aggregate contributed capital of its million stockholders. But if two laborers combine to do the same thing that the million stockholders have done, that is, refuse to deal with a buyer of their products, this is an illegal conspiracy. To the law, two laborers are more powerful than a corporation of $100,000,000 capital and one million shareholders, because the corporation is one legal person and each person is equal before the law.

Acceptance of this legal dogma that everyone must be considered as equal before the law has actually led one court to hold that women have a natural equality with men and hence must be per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted to work as many hours a day as a man (Richie vs. People, 155 Ill. 99,111), has induced another to ask what right the legislature had to "assume that one class had the need of protection against another" (State vs. Haun, 61 Kan. 146, 162), and has prompted another to state: "Theoretically there is among our citizens no inferior class" (Frorer vs. People, 141 Ill. 171, 186). Dean Pound has exposed a score of such examples in his article on "Liberty of Contract," in the Yale Law Journal, Vol. XVIII, pages 454-87.

Combinations of tradesmen, oil producers and laborers which achieve socially beneficial results cannot be judged and condemned by this mechanical principle—or fiction—that each person must be considered equal before the law. It is time that the courts brushed aside the legal curtain and saw behind it a swarm of foreign workmen who are not "equal" to multimillionaire manufacturers, and who are trying to gain a decent standard of living and employment. The courts should find the cause and purpose of their strikes and boycotts. If "reasonable" and in the public interest, they should be sustained as much as any merger or farm combination. The courts should see the puddles of wasted oil that blacken the surface of so much of this country and should realize that the oil situation is not the same as every other industrial problem in the United States, and that it cannot be judged arbitrarily by *a priori* "principles." The courts are bound to apply the same rule of reason, designed to further the public interest, to this problem that they have applied to others, notably the farm problem. Finally, the courts should visualize the predicament of the small tradesmen, and not insist that a corner grocery store is on a parity with Montgomery Ward or Sears Roebuck. They should permit these tradesmen to achieve through coöperation the same ends that the courts have approved through mergers. The courts should judge these situations, not by empty mechanical fictions, but by weighing the actual social facts.

Then the courts will not be gazing at the stars and finding in the heavens a perfectly balanced nonexistent world such as was pictured by our venerable practitioner, but will be truly meeting and settling our social frictions by facing them squarely and honestly.

MATHEW O. TOBRINER.

The Russian Bear in the Wheat Pit

THE PEN of Aristophanes alone could have done justice to the comedy enacted in this country following the discovery by Secretary Hyde that the All-Russian Textile Syndicate, a Soviet agency, had been selling wheat short on the Chicago grain exchange. The American farmer, no less bewildered by the confusion of political tongues than the Greek poet's Demos, learned that the activities of Soviet agents had served to depress the price of wheat which, mysteriously enough, had been steadily declining even without their aid. While Secretary Hyde declared that Soviet speculation in wheat was intended to stir up discontent among Western farmers, members of the Chicago Board of Trade (whom no one would describe as Reds) asserted that the syndicate had engaged in legitimate "hedging" operations and that, in any case, the amount of wheat involved would not materially affect prices on an exchange with a daily turnover of some fifty million bushels. The vice-president of the syndicate, in whose shoes we should not like to stand when he returns to Moscow, expressed not unnatural surprise at the excitement aroused by relatively unimportant short sales of wheat, when purchases by his organization of cotton, sugar and machinery aggregating millions of dollars had received no adverse comment. To complicate matters, unpleasant reference was made by certain Democratic Senators to the imminence of elections and the apparent necessity of diverting attention from the failures of the Republican administration. The upshot of it was that the Chicago Board of Trade passed a resolution stating that short selling "by any foreign government is a new development of commerce of seriously objectionable character" which must be brought to an end. Meanwhile, the price of wheat has fallen to the lowest point it has touched since 1906.

The charges made by Mr. Hyde followed close on the resumption of grain exports from the Soviet Union, and their sale in Europe at prices lower than those which American exporters were willing to accept. The European press seized upon reports of feverish shipping activities in the Black Sea, and depicted the Soviet government as ready to flood the world with cheap wheat for the purpose of demoralizing the workers and inciting them to revolution. The emergence of a Soviet "wheat peril" ensured a sympathetic hearing at Geneva for the agricultural nations of eastern Europe, which had previously made little headway with their demand for a preferential tariff. The Soviet government, *in absentia*, was held responsible for the agrarian crisis.

The reappearance of Russia in the world's grain market, alarming as it may seem to competitors who had failed to reckon with it, does not in itself constitute a new economic phenomenon. Prior to 1914, Russia exported as much as ten million tons of grain a year, chiefly to European countries. The transfer of land from the landlords to the peasants in 1917, its subsequent "fractioning," the depreda-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of civil war and, more recently, conflicts between the government and the *kulaks,* resulted in a marked decrease of agricultural production. The majority of the peasants, once they had satisfied their traditional "land hunger," found that they lacked the means to cultivate the soil. Moreover, the government's practice of requisitioning or buying grain at fixed prices far below those of manufactured goods, gave the more enterprising peasants very little incentive to produce a marketable surplus.

Even when allowance is made for increased consumption of grain by a growing population, a striking divergence may be observed between the amount of grain produced in the Soviet Union and that offered for sale by the peasants. The low productivity of agriculture has been accompanied by a decline in agricultural exports, especially grain. Following a new drive on the *kulaks* in 1926, grain exports became practically negligible, and small quantities of wheat had to be imported into the country during the past two years. The elimination of grain hampered Soviet purchases of machinery and semi-manufactured goods required for the further expansion of industry.

The collectivization of agriculture, which Stalin embarked upon despite protests by the right opposition, and subsequently checked when it aroused discontent among the "middle" peasants, was intended to expand the "socialized" at the expense of the "private" sector of agriculture, and to increase productivity. At the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist party, held in June, 1930, Stalin predicted that during the current year two million tons of marketable grain would be furnished by State farms, eight million by collective farms and six million by individual farms, and that a surplus of from two to four million tons would be made available for export. A recent dispatch from Moscow estimates that the exportable surplus will reach six million tons, or about half of the pre-war export.

At the present time an overwhelming proportion of the marketable grain comes from collective and individual farms which have concluded "contracts" with the government whereby, in return for credits and means of production, these farms undertake to deliver their produce to the State. The process of collecting the grain from the peasants is slow, and frequently unsatisfactory. Peasants have been known to hold the grain back until they had received manufactured goods, or sell their surplus to private traders at prices higher than those fixed by the government.

Collective farming, whatever may be its ultimate social and economic results, now entails considerable expenditure on the part of the government, and this outlay will have to be increased in the future if agriculture is to be thoroughly industrialized. The collective farms, generally composed of the less prosperous peasant holdings, depend on the government for tractors and other equipment. Unless the Soviet government succeeds in producing agricultural machinery at home in the very near future—which, in turn, would require the importation of means of production—it will be driven to export still larger quantities of such necessities as grain, butter, eggs and meat, the shortage of which is daily felt more acutely in the cities. Moreover, those peasants who were induced to enter the collectives by the expectation that they would receive clothes, boots and other goods, may prove unwilling to deliver grain above the bare minimum specified in their "contracts" with the State, and may even refuse to renew these "contracts" once they are adequately supplied with machinery and fertilizers. The production of consumers' goods lags far behind that of machinery, which is given first place on the Soviet economic front; in consequence, the manufactured commodities which were to serve as bait for members of collective farms remain few in quantity, poor in quality and exorbitant in price.

It is admitted by well informed observers that while the sale of Russian wheat may have aggravated the world-wide agrarian depression, it cannot with any regard for accuracy be considered one of its fundamental causes. Throughout the world high tariffs hamper the rational distribution of agricultural commodities, the production of which, in certain regions, has outstripped capacity for consumption. The agricultural countries of eastern Europe, meeting this summer at Warsaw, agreed that the decline in the price of agricultural products was due largely to overproduction. They advocated the conclusion of regional agreements as a step toward a general readjustment of Europe's economic policy, and demanded the adoption of a preferential tariff by European importers in favor of agricultural products of European origin.

Have the methods adopted by the Soviet government for the disposal of its products proved so injurious to Western trade as to place that government outside the pale of ordinary commercial intercourse? Even the severest critics concede that, while Soviet exports may have depressed certain industries, they have stimulated others, notably shipping and the manufacture of agricultural machinery. Charges of dumping by the Soviet government have not been substantiated, chiefly because of the difficulty of determining the cost of production when the State is exporter, producer and employer of labor in one. The height of the American tariff effectively bars the importation of Russian wheat into the United States. Should dumping of other commodities be proved, recourse may possibly be had to existing anti-dumping legislation. The Soviet government claims that, whenever it has undersold world prices, it has done so for the sole purpose of obtaining the foreign currency which it has not succeeded in obtaining in the form of loans and credits. There is no justification for assuming that if the Soviet government were in a more favorable financial position it would waive normal profits on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its exports. Unless all trade with the Soviet Union is to be entirely suspended, a way of meeting Soviet competition may have to be found in a more rational organization of production and distribution by capitalistic states.

In the last analysis, however, the question remains whether two such divergent economic systems as socialism and capitalism may be expected to exist peacefully side by side. We have traveled a long way from the World Economic Conference of 1927, when a Soviet delegate could envisage the possibility of such coexistence. Today official Soviet spokesmen do not conceal their conviction that the two systems are essentially antagonistic, and that the result of the struggle between them will determine the fate of Socialism not only in the Soviet Union but throughout the world.

VERA MICHELES DEAN.

New York City: Corruption as Usual

THE COURTS of New York City are at present involved in the worst scandal of their history. During the last two years such serious disclosures have been made concerning the ethics of the bench and the ethics of the individual members that no fewer than six justices have been forced to step down from their office in disgrace.

The series of judiciary scandals was originally precipitated by the crash of the City Trust Company. The ruins of that bankrupt institution disclosed the interesting fact that a special-sessions justice, Mancuso, had had a conspicuous hand in the administration of the bank's shady career. The Mancuso case was followed by others of a similar type, involving Judge Bernard E. Vause, Magistrate George Ewald and County Judge George Martin. In all of these cases the judge had lent the prestige of his name and office to one or more, and it was usually more, business-promotion schemes deserving no better a title than downright swindles.

Apart from the fact that most of these cases amount to violations of the federal statutes forbidding the use of the mails to defraud—for which Vause is under sentence of six years in Atlanta—they are even more clearly contrary to the code of judicial ethics. These instances reveal, however, that the justices flout one as freely as the other. Moreover, they cannot be regarded as mere isolated instances. They raise questions as to how many of their colleagues have busied themselves in their spare time with dubious promotion schemes in which their judicial reputations were a substantial part of the assets.

Of a different, but hardly less scandalous nature were the cases of Magistrate Vitale and Supreme Court Justice Joseph F. Crater. In the case of Magistrate Vitale it was disclosed that his relations with crooks, gunmen, racketeers and felons was a closer one than any reputable magistrate should have tolerated, while Crater's recent fantastic disappearance following the Ewald and Healy scandal, certainly has contributed little to the dignity of the New York judiciary.

The situation which these scandals revealed was not entirely unknown to the citizens of New York City. Everyone in the humbler ranks of the legal profession was privy to the conditions existing on the bench and doubtless considered them the natural order of things. The big-wigs of the bar, engrossed as they are in corporation practice, knew less about them, but it is they alone who can afford the time to serve on bar-association committees. Moreover, they are very sensitive about anything which may weaken popular faith in the sanctity of the law. It is a paradox that they normally would rather permit a condition to exist which gives the masses the impression that the administration of justice is a farce and a lottery, than participate in an exposure of this state.

As a matter of fact, the conditions here described have existed for seventy-five years. There have been periods of temporary and partial improvement but the system has been, if anything, strengthened by these occasional purgings. At any time in the last twenty years the bar associations of the city could have precipitated a series of disclosures just as shocking as those which now rock the city. Year after year its committees have met and sadly shaken their heads over the deplorable unfitness of the candidates which the two parties have nominated.

As a rule the judges are unlearned in the law, lacking in judicial temperament, deeply involved in unsound business enterprises, engrossed in politics and themselves products of a political machine. The merit system of appointment popularly known as "civil service" has been extended throughout most of the city government. It is circumvented and frustrated in many ways, but it has brought an encouraging improvement. Tammany has made many adjustments to the new dispensation, but has not been able completely to defeat its aims. County government and the courts remain the strongholds of the old-fashioned patronage. In both there is a numerous and growing body of employees who owe their places at least in part to examinations and who have what amounts to permanent tenure. But the whole atmosphere in which the courts work and have their being is political. The secretaries of the supreme-court judges are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

district leaders or the sons of leaders or their closest henchmen. The clerks of all of the minor courts and their more important deputies are active workers in the hives of either party.

The district courts have all but been appropriated by the district leaders in whose satrapies they fall. These neighborhood courts are remote from the downtown lawyers. A group of attorneys congregates in their immediate vicinities, making their offices appropriately enough in stores. Near to the civil or municipal courts the attorney shares his office with a marshal. The law office near the criminal or magistrates court is in combination with the bail bondsman. The buildings in which these courts are housed are badly arranged and decrepit. They are crowded, ill disciplined and buzzing with the confusion of countless huddles.

Nor should the district attorneys—for there are five of them—be overlooked. The retention of five such officers in the five counties of the city breeds confusion and ineffectiveness. County lines mean so little and county functions are so vague that the public hardly knows they exist, and in the counties other than New York County the district attorneys are subject to much less adequate editorial surveillance. Their offices are completely in politics. The district attorney's subordinates are named by the district leaders and every leader has an assistant district attorney who is one of his most useful lieutenants. In addition to which the office is "tribalized," the Irish, Jews, Italians, Negroes and others each having their quota of prosecutors as they have of judges. With the unquestionable improvement that has taken place in police administration, particularly since 1900, the burden of political fixing has shifted more and more to the prosecutor and the court personnel. Of course the morale of the police can never reach the highest level as long as that of the courts with which they are in daily contact is so badly impaired. In short, justice in the inferior courts of New York City is a racket just as water power is in the state or oil in the nation—and politics is the mother racket of them all.

Reporters, newspaper writers and editors, business men, large and small, have been thoroughly cognizant of these conditions. The journalists, at least, have hardly less responsibility for such conditions than the lawyers; unless they can claim that the facts were so well known that they were not news. There is scarcely a paper that is not now busy poking and probing for some new rascal to lynch, yet not one has the courage to examine the doings and connections of its own political and court reporters. New York could produce a whole squad of Jake Lingles.

But this judiciary situation by no means exists in New York alone. Anyone with even the meagerest acquaintance with the courts in Chicago, Philadelphia or Boston, and perhaps a hundred lesser cities, knows that they could duplicate every detail of the system in New York. Indeed, the conditions in these three cities are, if anything, worse, because there is less party discipline, worse police administration and a less vigilant and virile minority group. The Koenig machine of New York is anything but vigilant, virile or virtuous, but there are some sound elements in the party in the state which can be counted on for a vigorous display of indignation when there is prospect of making Tammany a campaign issue.

Most of the current scandals were sown and nurtured by Charles H. Tuttle. Mr. Tuttle is one of the keenest and cleverest political husbandmen in the land. He has sifted the current bumper crop of rumors and has brought forth kernels of truth. With a keen sense of news values he has slowly fed these to the press. His work, carefully planned, has slowly matured. His harvest has been like manna to the starved Republicans of the state.

The fact that his efforts have been politically motivated should not detract from Mr. Tuttle's rare genius. Issues aside—and he is just a bit too eager to put them aside—he is a worthy man for the governorship. His work has required not only patience but skill and courage. His early efforts met with countless obstacles. What would probably have been his stellar case—an effort to link one of the most powerful leaders of Tammany with a wholesale and retail bootleg ring—was frustrated by a corrupt subordinate. There have been other keen disappointments which left him equally undaunted. It appears that corruption will be his whole campaign. The not too courageous Roosevelt has given him an opening. In at least two cases he has taken machine dictation of appointments. Mancuso's successor, Bertini, was chosen with unseemly haste and without any demonstration of fitness. The vanished Crater was doubtless fit, but the story of his appointment is yet to be told.

Never daring to cast off the Tammany livery, Roosevelt has never taken the initiative. When it becomes indecent to delay longer he acts with as much show of firmness and indignation as he can muster. When Curry and other leaders of Tammany astounded the city by refusing to waive immunity and testify before the Governor's special grand jury, Mr. Roosevelt, after waiting a week, during which the Republicans met and nominated Mr. Tuttle, sharply called on Mayor Walker to instruct those on the public pay roll to return and testify, but only as to their official acts. His letter sounded vigorous but was equivocal in meaning. Moreover, he did not send it until he had communicated its contents to Mr. Curry over the telephone.

What will be the permanent results of all these unsavory disclosures? It is true there have been some tangible accomplishments and we may expect a few more. Mayor Walker at first curtly rejected the proffered assistance of the city bar association in appointing magistrates. But the scandals continued to mount, and when he next came to fill several vacancies he chose men exceptionally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well qualified in training and character. I need only name the able and alert Chief Magistrate Corrigan. Popular excitement also forced the Tammany and McCooey machines sullenly to endorse two sitting Republican judges who had been slated to go. The Governor is also to be credited with one good appointment, along with several poor ones. He promises legislation to require a waiver of the immunity against self-incrimination on the part of public officers, and there is some faint prospect of an improvement in the manner of selecting magistrates. But all of these amount merely to putting a white collar on the dirty shirt of justice. As long as judges are chosen on the basis of political or other service to ward leaders, as long as these leaders continue to name the clerks, bailiffs and prosecutors and themselves occupy many important posts in the court personnel, the net result of all the present furore will be, in round numbers, zero. JOSEPH MCGOLDRICK.

Good News from Wisconsin

A FREQUENT remark now heard in Wisconsin is that "the La Follette name can still sway the voters." Conservatives, not pleased with the outcome of the recent primary, when Philip La Follette was nominated for Governor on the Republican ticket, are in the habit of adding with some asperity that "a lot of those farmers up north think the old man [referring to the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, who was a power in the state for many years] is still alive and running for office." Those of a progressive persuasion are greatly encouraged by the 111,000 majority which young La Follette obtained over his millionaire opponent, Governor Kohler. The betting odds favored the Governor ten to six. And in view of the fact that Mr. Kohler had nearly all of the daily newspapers of the state on his side and an obviously larger amount of money to promote his candidacy, the size of La Follette's majority is indeed impressive. Perhaps unduly optimistic over the significance of such a victory, progressives are convinced that great legislative achievements relating to economic issues are in store.

Doubtless La Follette is a name to conjure with in Wisconsin. At least there was enough pulling power in the name for the voters to disregard the contention that because one La Follette (Robert, Jr.) is in the United States Senate, it would be undesirable to raise his younger brother to the governorship. But to ascribe Philip La Follette's large majority completely to his distinguished parentage is to place altogether too much reliance upon word magic. It is clear in retrospect that any one of a half-dozen progressives could have defeated Governor Kohler for the nomination. The explanation in large part is simply the prolonged depression which has affected the psychology of Wisconsin voters. Despite the fact that in Milwaukee and in some of the smaller industrial centers of the state unemployment has not been as extensive as in certain other sections of the country, conditions among wage earners have been bad enough to create great dissatisfaction.

In Milwaukee County, which Governor Kohler's supporters counted on to give him a large majority, La Follette received 5,400 more votes than the Governor. In this connection it is noteworthy that in the two largest Socialist wards of the city, which regularly roll up decisive majorities for the Socialist Mayor Hoan and also send Socialist aldermen to the city council, La Follette's majority over Kohler exceeded 5,000. Likewise, La Follette ran strong in nearly all of the agricultural sections of the state.

Indications seem to justify the belief that Philip La Follette is essentially no more a demagogue than was his father. He is an actor, undoubtedly, but not an insincere one. He is thirty-three years of age and his relative youthfulness was claimed by his opponents to signify immaturity. But he has been district attorney of Dane County, where Madison is located, and in this position he has given a very creditable account of himself. Mr. La Follette's legal ability is of a quality which caused the State University Law School to arrange with him to fill a lectureship. It is, of course, true that he lacks administrative experience, but on the whole his background is a better qualification for leadership in a legislative program than the experience of Governor Kohler

An important source of dissatisfaction, among the rural population in particular, is the growth of "chain banking." The past year has been marked by the rapid expansion of this system of dispensing credit. The center of the chain, the First Wisconsin, is the largest bank in Milwaukee. With this bank have been merged all but two or three of the leading banks of the city. The First Wisconsin was stimulated to embark upon chain banking by the incursion into the state of another chain with headquarters in Minneapolis. But in spite of the Wisconsin chain's avowal of being primarily motivated by its sense of patriotic obligation to save the state's citizens from the dangerous necessity of patronizing a "foreign" chain, many voters apparently were not reassured. Crowds in rural communities were completely with La Follette when he denounced the "monopolistic" control of credit by chain banks.

The efficacy of opposition to this type of credit institution is likely to be viewed with skepticism by those closely familiar with past and present economic tendencies. It would appear to have been demonstrated conclusively that the merger and amalgamation movement, of which chain banking is one manifestation, cannot be stopped by legislative devices. Opposition of the sort La Follette stands for may, however, provide as its final outcome a more adequate kind of regulation than would otherwise result.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A greater opportunity for positive public service is presented in the La Follette progressives' position on the power question. The progressives sponsor a program of legislation designed to facilitate municipal and regional publicly owned power development. The existing laws, in effect, tie the hands of those who seek to inaugurate public development. This situation, much to the liking of the Insull companies, the North American and other power groups, can be remedied only by enabling legislation. The necessary bills were introduced at the last legislature, where most of them, in consequence of the conservative-controlled senate and Governor Kohler's lack of interest, were defeated. In this vital economic field, the progressives have evidently become disillusioned over the prospect of effectively regulating the private companies through the state railroad commission—one of the first manifestations of "the Wisconsin idea" of commission regulation and one in the realization of which the elder La Follette played a prominent part. The plan is now to obtain regulation by means of "measuring sticks" in the form of publicly owned and operated plants. During the primary campaign the progressives appear to have placed undue emphasis on water power, for while Wisconsin still possesses certain undeveloped power sites, the major share of future development must come from steam-operated plants. This is especially so in the heavily industrialized southeastern section of the state where Milwaukee is situated and where available water power is negligible.

True to past experience, taxation was a prominent subject of discussion during the primary campaign. La Follette and his fellow progressives promise revision which will lessen the burden on real estate. This is a worthy objective, because the existing incidence of real-estate taxes, in Wisconsin as elsewhere, falls mainly on farmers and those of relatively small means in the towns and cities. But since real-estate tax rates are chiefly determined by local taxing bodies, it is a little difficult to see how substantial relief can come from the state government—unless the legislature is prepared to make basic alterations in the whole tax structure.

However, in the well administered state income tax there exists the instrument which may supply the entering wedge for bringing about the ultimate attainment of a tax system much more nearly approaching the ideal of ability to pay. The progressives, if they carry out their platform promises, can be expected to move cautiously in this direction, utilizing the graduated surtax as a means of obtaining their objective. Efforts along this line, however, will be handicapped because the rates already in effect under the federal law supply a certain superficial plausibility to the contention that heavier state income taxes constitute confiscatory double taxation. Moreover, at the first sign of any move to increase the income tax on corporations, the argument, long familiar to Wisconsin residents, will be advanced that such a course is calculated to drive industry from the state. The progressives, none the less, offer the best bet in sight for those who believe that a movement toward genuine tax reform is overdue.

Similarly, concerning labor legislation, the progressives may be expected to move faster than their conservative opponents. To the credit of Governor Kohler, in the campaign before the primary he endorsed in principle unemployment insurance, although he felt impelled to qualify his endorsement with the familiar mistaken identification of state unemployment insurance with "doles." Evidently his opinion is that a successful insurance plan can be put into operation by each firm or industry, with the whole arrangement under state supervision.

As a matter of fact, Governor Kohler spoke more definitely to the point concerning unemployment insurance than did Mr. La Follette. Whether La Follette's vagueness was in deference to what he may have construed as conservatism on this subject among his agrarian supporters, remains to be discovered. On the whole, concerning such matters as unemployment insurance and liberalization of workmen's compensation, La Follette would appear to have a better chance than Kohler to lead the legislature. For should Kohler decide to lead, his conservative group in the legislature would by no means unanimously follow him. It is noteworthy in this connection that while Governor Kohler had the political astuteness to sign certain measures desired by organized labor, there was no public evidence of leadership from him in initiating and obtaining the passage of the bills through the legislature. In addition, his appointees to vacancies on the state supreme court, irreproachable though they may be in other respects, are not of a character to make one sanguine over the fate of labor legislation appealed to the court on grounds of unconstitutionality. In this respect, as in others, there is more reason to expect favorable results for liberalism in consequence of La Follette's appointments.

In the administration of the state's system of life insurance there is an immediate opportunity of special significance that should afford a test of the progressivism of Philip La Follette. During several years past, from all indications, the private insurance companies have succeeded in sabotaging any inclination on the part of those in charge of this potentially important branch of the state's business to expand or even to give publicity to the sale of insurance. Whether or not this is a complete explanation, Governor Kohler's "business administration" has not seen fit to push the work of this department, which offers citizens of the state policies on very attractive terms.

Though his name alone is much too simple an explanation for Mr. La Follette's decisive primary victory, which is equivalent to election, whether he stays in office for a second term will doubtless depend in considerable part upon whether he reveals his father's qualities of leadership. It is not un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely that important elements in his legislative program will be blocked through probable conservative domination of the senate. Possibly this difficulty can be overcome by proficiency in playing the political game behind the scenes. If that does not succeed, Governor La Follette will probably not hesitate to take the stump in senatorial districts on behalf of those candidates who will support progressive policies. In any case, a beneficial by-product of the industrial depression is a shuffling of the cards for a new political deal. If La Follette and his lieutenants can convince the state's voters that politics means something more to them than a game in which the chief stakes are office and prestige, in all likelihood they will have every opportunity they need to demonstrate whether progressivism can accomplish major economic improvements on behalf of disadvantaged groups. LYLE W. COOPER.

News and the Newspaper

II. *The Detection of Journalistic Bias*

IT IS AN axiom of our judicial system, as well as a prime tenet in any code of sportsmanship and fair play, that in any controversy each side must be given an equal opportunity to state its case. Newspapers, too, have given this ethical principle due attention, as witness the following statement in the code adopted in 1923 by the National Association of Newspaper Editors: "Sound practice makes clear distinction between news reports and expressions of opinion. News reports should be free from opinion or bias of any kind." William Randolph Hearst, in personal instructions to his newspapers, goes even further: "Be fair and impartial in the news columns at least. . . . Give unbiased news of all creeds and parties. Try to do this in such a conspicuous manner that it will be *noticed* and *commented* upon."

Against this, as an indication of public opinion in the matter of how well the newspapers are carrying out their lofty ideals, we have the experience of Professor C. G. Dittmer, who addressed to 150 summer-school students at New York University the question: "Do you feel that the newspapers are guilty of 'coloring the news,' pandering to the interests, and not giving us 'all the news that's fit to print?'" In answer he received 119 yesses, 24 noes and 7 blanks.

If this response is at all representative of intelligent opinion, the newspapers are under a portentous cloud of suspicion and antagonism. Do they, however, deserve it? The spectrum analysis of the press described in our first article shows that no sweeping generalizations as to sensationalism can be made; newspapers range all the way from the most lurid thrill-mongers to the most socialized servants of citizenship. We shall now apply to a representative group of newspapers a technique for measuring the distortion of news.

A convenient instance is offered in a controversy which took place in the Senate at the close of January, 1929, in which Senators Reed of Missouri and Brookhart of Iowa clashed dramatically over the issue of preparedness versus internationalism. On January 29, Brookhart made a long speech against a pending bill providing for the building of fifteen cruisers. Reed, on the following day, answered with a fiery denunciation of pacifists and a plea for preparedness. Brookhart immediately made a rebuttal.

Were the newspapers impartial in their handling of this matter? To answer this question, a purely quantitative analysis was first made, covering a list of ten newspapers whose editorial policies ranged from opposition to advocacy of increased preparedness, to determine how fairly space was divided between the two contestants in the controversy. The results in column inches are tabulated below:

	Space Given Reed	Space Given Brookhart	Ratio Reed / Brookhart
New York World	5.6	6.7	.8
New York Herald Tribune	12.1	13.1	.9
Boston Transcript	4.4	3.5	1.3
Springfield Republican	10.5	6.8	1.5
New York Times	20.2	10.9	1.8
United States Daily	18.7	8.6	2.2
Boston Herald	17.4	7.2	2.4
Christian Science Monitor	9.9	3.3	3.0
Chicago Herald-Examiner	34.3	3.9	8.8
New York American	44.1	2.5	17.6

But, as any newspaper editor would immediately point out, fair reporting in this instance does not necessarily imply an equal allotment of space to each party: any paper may well have been justified in feeling that Reed's speech made a better story than Brookhart's two speeches. As a matter of fact, the median, or average for the ratio between Reed and Brookhart in all the newspapers studied, will be seen to be almost exactly 2.0. This, perhaps, may be taken as the fair practical measure of allotment of space in the matter.

To determine the actual bias of each newspaper, for Brookhart or for Reed, the ratio given in the first table must be divided by the median. If, however, a newspaper devoted space to each side in exactly the median ratio, the quotient of this division would be 1.0, while its bias would of course actually be zero. Therefore, to reduce these quotients to measures of bias, 1.0 was subtracted from each.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When a measure of bias derived in this way is less than 1.0, it is quite probable that accidental factors were responsible for the indicated variation from the median allotment of space. When the ratio is more than 3.0, the basis, even though it may have been accidental, is certainly culpable from the standpoint of impartial journalism. This method indicates for each newspaper the following degree of bias in the treatment of the debate:

	Bias in Favor of Reed (R) or Brookhart (B)
New York American	R 7.8
Chicago Herald-Examiner	R 3.4
New York World	B 1.4
Boston Transcript	B .6
Christian Science Monitor	R .5
Springfield Republican	B .3
Boston Herald	R .2
United States Daily	R .1
New York Times	B .1
New York Herald Tribune	B 1.2

The newspapers studied, it will be noticed, are not by any means among the more sensational: all, in fact, had plus scores in the socialization-sensationalism spectrum tabulated in our first article. It is not surprising, therefore, that—with the exception of two Hearst papers, The New York American and The Chicago Herald-Examiner—the degree of bias in reporting in each newspaper is gratifyingly low. Particularly noteworthy is the case of The New York Herald Tribune, which in its news columns showed a space ratio favorable to Brookhart, while editorially it was strongly opposed to his policies.

However, a purely quantitative test is only roughly indicative of newspaper bias. Far more important is a study of fairness in reporting the facts —of whether, by suppression or distortion of one statement and by exaggerated emphasis on another, the general aspect of the news is colored according to the individual newspaper's bias in the matter. To test this, all the reports of the debate were analyzed into definite "fact-points," or units of information, with which the story given in each newspaper was compared. Immediately, the evidence of bias becomes more striking.

The New York American, for instance, most militaristic of all the newspapers studied, carried a six-column headline: "Reed Makes Fiery Plea for Cruisers," followed by half-inch capitals: "Senator Hits Pacifists in Great Speech." In all, the headline space allotted by The American totaled 12.2 column inches, and the lead with which it introduced the story was highly laudatory of Reed and condemnatory of internationalists:

> That sturdy American statesman, Senator James A. Reed, Democrat of Missouri, sang his swan song in the Senate today. It was a clarion call to patriots to demand enactment of the cruiser bill.
>
> The stirring appeal of the fighting Missourian for the protection of America first bristled with bitter denunciation of pacifism. Internationalism he bluntly characterized as treason.... His colleagues... listened with rapt attention to his intense American appeal.

It continued with a far fuller verbatim account of Reed's utterances than any other paper, especially of those passages most bitterly denunciatory of pacifism: " 'The first duty of this body is to protect America . . . to close our ears to the whimperings and whinings. . . . To my mind the lowest form of animal life is the citizen of any country who thinks more of internationalism than he does of nationalism. . . . The man who would cry down the patriotism of his country . . . is not worthy to live a minute under the flag!' . . . With withering scorn he turned on 'the white-livered men who, back in 1912, said there would be no more war.' "

By contrast, the space The American allotted to Brookhart's two speeches in the debate was so slight that it may be reproduced in full. On January 30, the following paragraph covered the first speech:

> Senator Brookhart (R), of Iowa, led the debate for the elimination of the time clause in the Senate today, but said he would not vote for the cruisers even if it is stricken out. He criticized regular Republicans for opposing the President and President-elect on the feature.

The total report in The American of Brookhart's side of the debate on January 31 was:

> When Brookhart interrupted to say Napoleon died a prisoner on the Island of St. Helena, Reed retorted....

and

> A Great Speech
>
> Even Senator Smith W. Brookhart, Republican of Iowa, Reed's antagonist in the debate, who proudly announced himself as a pacifist, in tribute said it was the greatest speech that will ever be delivered here by the school of the old order of things.

The degree to which the above use of Brookhart's opening remarks distorts their true significance becomes evident when compared with what he really said, as reported in most of the other papers. It is merely a matter of striking out a few words here and there, but it changes the meaning considerably:

> We have just listened to the greatest speech that will ever be delivered from the school of the old order of things—the school that starts with cannibalism. I believe we can get away from cannibalism. . . .

Moreover, The American's clause, "Brookhart . . . who proudly announced himself a pacifist," will bear comparison with his actual statement:

> If war were declared tomorrow I would resign and enlist. . . . I have volunteered three times in the service of my country, and I am not ashamed to stand up in the Senate and say I am a pacifist.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In general, it seems fair to conclude that The American's treatment of the debate appears deliberately to have been constructed to the end of glorifying jingo militarism and twisting Brookhart's remarks so as to malign him and enhance his opponent.

The way in which the editorial bias distorts the news by means of prejudiced headlining and partiality in omitting or including points is strikingly illustrated by the handling of one Associated Press dispatch by three papers of differing policies. One, The Chicago Herald-Examiner, owned by Hearst, was strongly militaristic. A second paper, The Boston Herald, was moderately militaristic. The third paper was The Springfield Republican, whose editorials showed an inclination toward favoring international peace.

"Reed Calls Anti-Cruiser Fight Treason. Peace Treaties No Match for Bullets, Senator Reed Warns. Close Ears to Whinings and Build!" the other Hearst paper, The Chicago Herald-Examiner, headlined its story. "Reed in Plea for Big Navy. Missourian Hits Brookhart as 'Admiral' and 'Custodian of Universe,'" said The Boston Herald, while The Springfield Republican, opposed to the cruiser bill, characterized Reed's speech in its headlines as "caustic," and gave Brookhart's position more prominence.

The same bias follows through the news story itself, as reported by these three newspapers. Thus, The Herald-Examiner quotes largely from the text of Reed's speech: "I have heard this siren song before. I heard it in 1922 and I heard it in 1914. There were some professors—there were some anemic, I would almost say white-livered, men going about this country singing 'I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier'. . . . Over yonder in France . . . rest tens of thousands of American boys whose blood ought to be visited upon the heads of those who would not permit this country to defend itself." These passages were completely omitted by The Boston Herald and The Springfield Republican.

The Hearst paper, in turn, omitted the passages from Brookhart's speech, quoted by the anti-cruiser papers, in which he described his persecution by militaristic organizations, and criticized army methods and army training. In general, each newspaper devoted its energies to presenting most attractively the argument for the side it tended editorially to favor, and culled from the opposition largely those facts most likely to set its adversaries at a disadvantage.

There were, however, some exceptions. The headlines of The New York Times displayed a distinguished impartiality, while The New York Herald Tribune revealed a pronounced disinterestedness of outlook in its reporting as well. In addition to summarizing Brookhart's criticism of the army, it explained that he had been an instructor in rifle practice during the World War, and had, before that, been a member of the National Guard and one of the leading rifle experts in the country, thereby adding authority to his objections to militarism.

Moreover, after almost every paper had carried a news item giving the impression that Hoover favored both the cruiser bill and the enforcing time clause, The Herald Tribune alone was enterprising and disinterested enough to obtain a denial from Hoover's headquarters, thereby prejudicing its own editorial stand in the matter, but scooping its rivals. Such honesty in handling the news contrasts very favorably with the general tendency to permit an editor to color reports.

Few newspapers adopt so unpartisan a position. Not only in preparedness versus internationalism, but in such other debatable issues as Wet-Dry, Capitalist-Labor, White-Negro, Protestant-Catholic, Democrat-Republican and so on, the same methods of analyzing newspaper bias can be applied, and the same conclusions will ordinarily be reached.

An illustration is seen in connection with the tariff controversy which occupied the Senate during the summer of 1929. An analysis of fourteen newspapers showed a range of bias from complete one-sidedness in favor of low tariff on the part of The Atlanta Constitution, to 1.8 in favor of high tariff by The United States Daily. The pro-tariff bias of The United States Daily, whose motto is "All the facts, no opinion," is particularly disturbing.

Even in the case of The New York American, whose quantitative bias was zero, a distinct editorial flavor is perceptible in its handling of the news. The following excerpt from its news columns sounds far more like an editorial comment than a reportorial statement:

> Day by day, evidence is piling up that the country is opposed to another tariff "grab" at this time. The strategy of the "old guard," therefore, is to put through this tariff bill as quickly as possible. . . . The announcement by Smoot that he favors reducing the tariff on automobiles was interpreted as a "gesture" by the "arch protectionist" of the Senate to offset the charge that the Hawley bill will raise rates upward. . . .

For their observances and their violations of their codes of impartiality, therefore, newspapers cannot be condemned or applauded indiscriminately any more than for their sensationalism and their socialization. Some, like The New York American, violate flagrantly their own avowed principles. Others, like The New York Herald Tribune, give clear evidence of efforts to maintain the highest canons of the profession.

HORNELL HART, SUSAN M. KINGSBURY AND ASSOCIATES.

The third article of the series on "News and the Newspaper" will present additional evidence of the distortion of news, based on an analysis of headlines.—THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

BY THE time this is printed the fall campaign will have reached the really interesting stage. At this moment it is still conspicuous largely for wind, most of which blows from the dark caverns of the two party-propaganda departments in Washington, where the astute Michelson on the one side and the industrious West on the other ply the party bellows with fanatical zeal. The peripatetic "gentlemen of the press" are preparing for their preëlection "swing around the circle." In a short while their profound analytical pieces describing conditions in the several states and forecasting the result will appear in the various more or less influential journals they so ably represent. This is the regular procedure and I must confess that in the past I have not found it helps to enlighten the real situation. It has in fact always seemed slightly absurd to me to think a Washington correspondent, hopping in and hopping out of a state after twenty-four hours of hasty talks with local newspaper editors, can write with authority upon the outcome of a state campaign.

It has been my experience that in any state where a real fight is on, neither the politicians, the managers, the candidates or the editors know anything real about the situation. All they do is to guess that the outcome will be what they hope, and they argue themselves into believing, that it will be. Hence my skepticism about the erudite reports of the fast-flying correspondents. However these "swings about the circle" are not without their uses. They freshen up the "boys," give them a lot of nice, new "contacts" and a generally pleasant time, not in the least marred by the fact that they travel and live very well at office expense. But, I repeat, they do not get very much information, largely because there is no one in a position to furnish it. The truth is, there is not a single one of the so-called national leaders on either side with any solid foundation for a worth-while prediction as to what will happen in the November election. There is just as much substance in the raucous claims of the Democratic Shouse that Democratic control of the next House is a certainty as there is in the solemn assurances of the righteous Fess that a Republican majority is safe—just as much and no more.

On form, and under normal conditions, the odds should favor a continuation of Republican control of the House, for two reasons—first, because the country is normally Republican; second, because that party now has so large a margin—103 to be exact—that it can stand a shrinkage of fifty and still retain its grip. Basing their hope on these fundamental facts, the Republicans in closest touch with the White House, chief of whom just now is the skillful Brown, who picked Fess as chairman and pulls the strings of the national committee from his desk in the Post Office department, count on at least a majority of thirty. This is allowing a loss of approximately thirty-five seats due to the inevitable back swing of the pendulum in the off year and such resentment against the Hoover administration as may have resulted from the business slump, unemployment and other causes. It may be mentioned that this Republican idea of thirty as the smallest possible majority is likewise cherished by the gifted Mr. Longworth, though he can hardly be considered an entirely detached observer. If there should be no majority at all, he would lose the speakership with its accompanying automobile, chauffeur and other perquisites, compensations, emoluments and rewards.

On the other side, the Democratic belief is that the above-mentioned normal Republican advantages will be completely nullified and eliminated by a great wave of anti-Hoover feeling among the common people, engendered by the iniquities of the new tariff law, the lack of prosperity and the general agricultural distress. As a result of these things the Democrats believe that the whole Republican majority of 103 will disappear in a Democratic sweep and that the next Congress will see the Honorable Jack Garner of Texas enthroned as Speaker, directing a militant and united Democratic majority. Many stranger things have happened. I am prepared to view them without shock or sorrow, but I would have a little more confidence in their occurrence if it were not for my conviction, previously expressed in this place, that in the so-called off-year elections, candidates for Congress in every district in every state are elected or defeated not because of national issues, conditions, reasons or figures, but largely—and often exclusively—because of the local district situation and the personal strength or weakness of the individual nominee.

In the presidential years it is vastly different. Then the tide one way or the other overcomes local conditions and personal strength. Men are swept into Congress or swept out regardless of normal party majorities and their own personalities. But in the mid-term elections, it is very much a local matter. This does not mean that the Republicans will not lose a lot of seats in November. On the contrary, they are absolutely sure to do so. But it does not follow that they will lose, except in isolated instances, districts that are normally Republican and where there is a normal fight between the everyday run of candidates.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the Democrats' expectation of a great sweep is based on the notion that the people as a whole have taken the Democratic propaganda as 100-percent real, and have accepted the Democratic publicity bureau's estimate of the complete worthlessness and futility of the Hoover administration. Perhaps they have, this time—though they rarely do. This time, of course, the Democratic propaganda has been exceptionally well done, long sustained and unquestionably effective. It has, in fact, been unprecedentedly voluminous and to a considerable extent unopposed. Certainly it has succeeded in convincing a great many Democrats in all sections that the Hoover administration is doomed and the people ripe for revolt. The election will be the one real way in which we can know exactly how effective it really is. Possibly we may find the popular mind so completely soaked in it that, combined with the trade decline and other factors of unrest among the voters, the local reasons that in the past have always been decisive in the districts will be swept aside and an upset irretrievably disastrous to the badgered Herbert and his political fortunes will occur. It will be interesting to see. Freely confessing that I know no more about the outcome than the politicians, managers, candidates, editorial writers and "swing about the circle boys"—but just as much—I await the result in calm. I have no personal interest in that speakership automobile. T. R. B.

Washington.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Vase for Telemachus

LATELY I have been reading (thanks to a number of kind tipsters, including Miss Edith Sitwell) the "Odyssey" of Alexander Pope. The pleasures of the enterprise have been many: poetry so firm, bright and precise is rare in English. The particular pleasure I wish to speak about is one too low for the attention of anybody so refined as Miss Sitwell. Only an uncouth Westerner, like myself, who has suffered much from the rigors of civilization, could appreciate the thrill I experienced on reading the farewell speech of Telemachus to Menelaus in Book IV. Among other things, the young man says:

> In dear remembrance of your royal grace
> I take the present of the promised vase.

Grace, trace, race, place—these words all rhyme together and with vase. Incontestably, Mr. Pope pronounced vase the way I do.

Mr. Pope is the only Englishman I ever heard of who did. Years ago, when I first went to London, I was told that vase was a word of French origin which was still pronounced in the French fashion. In order to be understood I have pronounced this word as if it were French in England; but in my native land nature takes its course, and I say it as they do on the lone prairie.

But at what point, one might inquire, did the word "vase" become French in English? It might have been (like so many words) French at some time or other. It was certainly already English by the beginning of the eighteenth century. Somebody tampered with the word between that time and our own, for nowadays you would find no Englishman, and precious few of the really *nice* Americans, who say the word out boldly as it is spelled.

The Oxford Dictionary, so illuminating on most matters of this sort, is simply obscurantist about vase. The preferred pronunciation given is vahz; the archaic is vawz; and the "archaic & U. S." is väs.

The ludicrous truth is probably this: some popinjay afflicted with too much Continental culture (somebody like Horace Walpole) got hold of the word in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century and Frenchified it—disseminated the notion that it was inelegant, unrefined, to say the word as it is spelled. This was a pity. English is not a language which can afford any more eccentricity of accent than it already possesses. With its multiple vowel sounds, its diphthongs and its many silent letters, it is already as eccentric as a language can be and live. The addition of gratuitous difficulties from foreign tongues does not make its life any more comfortable. The next time I go to London I shall take occasion to shout "vase," pronounced in the "archaic & U. S." manner, as often as possible in public, and refer objectors to the Wasp of Twickenham.

The English are illogical about this particular word, but they have the edge on us with a good many others. In our Middle West, for example, you run the risk of never having your trousers pressed unless you know that the hotel functionary who does the pressing is called a vallay. If you telephone downstairs and ask for the valet, delay and embarrassment are the results. It was sensible of the English to Anglicize this word; it is ridiculous of us not to do so, since the word vallay, now in use from Buffalo to Los Angeles, is not English or French or good red American.

The only sound English rule is to Anglicize foreign words, but a lamentable disagreement arises as to the point of age at which this should be done. Surely garage, for instance, has been in the language long enough to be pronounced according to the ordinary rules of English speech; yet all but fanatics still say it in a sort of hit-or-miss French. In America (particularly in garages) the word is pronounced gurrodge, which is plainly no language at all. This brings us to the main reason why words ought to be taken into the language as rapidly as possible once they have begun to enter: if they are left half in and half out, mi-figue mi-raisin, they are likely to be perpetuated in unpleasant, barbaric forms. This has already happened with garage, massage and camouflage, which become gurrodge, mussodge and cammaflodge in the speech of most of our compatriots. It is said that among theater people the word "ingenue" is pronounced anjenoo, and that in the shops lingerie is called lanjry or even lonjeray. Both of these seem misuses of the organs of communication. Such words are hard to say, hard to understand and hardest of all to listen to. Would it not be far simpler to pronounce them, and all other French words in common use, by the common rules of English speech? It is not necessary to say june filly for *jeune fille;* such expressions, which do not figure currently in the vernacular, could be left untouched. But all those words having to do with the French sciences of motor transport, perfumery, war, women's clothes and the fugitive fancies of the upper classes (chic matters, in short) ought to be frankly domesticated and Anglicized now that they have made themselves at home in the language. Certainly the French waste no time in attempting to pronounce our words in our own outlandish way. Anybody who has ever heard a Frenchman pronounce the word watercloset realizes that the Gallic spirit does not temporize with cultural accretions.

It will be argued that Anglo-Saxons are illogical by nature as the French are logical, and that it is our cultural genius to contradict ourselves. The amazing diversity of the English speech is held to be a result of this genial lack of logic. Up to a certain point—to about a hundred years ago, before English became a universal *lingua franca*—this may have been both true and desirable. Now it is possibly still vestigially true, but it is no longer desirable. We need standard speech. None of the anarchic impulses, none of the random animosities and affinities which controlled Western civilization from the Renaissance to the present, can be said to offer good reasons for a continued existence under the emerging forms of life in our century. In one way or another—and I can think of exactly two, which may after all be the same one—we move toward the mechanization by which individual energy can be freed from the waste labors of random variation. The difference in speech between, say, Senator Brookhart and the Secretary of the Navy, is a random variation produced by conditions of life which are not likely to continue. The difference between my pronunciation of vase and that of better educated persons is a random variation of the same character.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The question of mandatory standards in English speech is a new one. In the old days, *laissez faire* in these matters was more than a policy; it was a habit, almost a folkway. People were actually proud of the extraordinary variations they owed to circumstances beyond their control. Variability based on social and economic hazard cannot be maintained when these hazards are removed; nor can such deviations withstand the machine. The English recognized the portentous fact two years ago by establishing a committee on standard speech for the British Broadcasting Company. But the English cling to individualism with an imperial tenacity; and the august committee, of which Mr. Bernard Shaw was a member, not only failed to agree on a good many words, but failed to make its conclusions mandatory even when they had been unanimously reached.

With us it is different. We are not likely ever to take the question of pronunciation seriously enough to debate it. It is improbable that we shall ever consciously establish a code for standard machine speech. Such is not our way. And yet without conscious effort—with no intelligent attempt to do so—we tend to standard. The machine does it for us. Already our regional differences are diminishing; our class differences in speech are only just perceptible and the whole question of the pronunciation of our language will soon become—as it should become—a simple matter of information.

VINCENT SHEEAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

Is Mr. Hoover a Dry?

SIR: In The New Republic of July 30, T. R. B. writes:

> . . . Mr. Hoover is not, and never has been a prohibitionist; he never said he was. He sincerely believes in enforcing the law as it is . . . but at no time and in no place has he ever indicated his belief in its wisdom or perfection.

It is my recollection that Mr. Hoover did make some such statement as "I do not favor the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment or its subsidiary laws" when he was asked this question pointblank during his preëlection tour of the South. The statement, in fact, may have been incorporated into his campaign speech at Nashville, Tennessee.

I should like to disabuse myself of this impression, and would much appreciate an answer, either private or public, giving exactly what Mr. Hoover did say at that time.

New York City. DANTON WALKER.

[The speech to which Mr. Walker evidently refers was the one Mr. Hoover delivered at Elizabethton, Tennessee. Mr. Hoover's only reference to prohibition in that speech, in fact the only reference to prohibition he made during his entire campaign, went as follows: "The purpose of the Eighteenth Amendment is to protect the American home. A sacred obligation is imposed upon the President to secure its honest enforcement and to eliminate the abuses which have grown up around it. I wish it to succeed." The line, however, which Mr. Walker quotes comes from Mr. Hoover's speech of acceptance in which he said: "I do not favor the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. I stand for the efficient enforcement of the laws enacted thereunder. Whoever is chosen President has under his oath a solemn duty to pursue this course. Our country has deliberately undertaken a great social and economic experiment, noble in motive and far-reaching in purpose." T. R. B.'s contention, however, still stands. Mr. Hoover respects the Amendment, but he has never made any statement which could possibly be interpreted to mean that he respects the idea on which the Amendment is based.—THE EDITORS.]

Romanism and Tammany Hall

SIR: It is very apparent in the article, "Why Tammany Survives," in The New Republic of October 1, that the author has not risen above the fears that Heywood Broun once remarked affected all New York journalism and prevent it from telling the truth about the Roman Catholic Church's grip on the New York situation. Tammany exists because the Roman Catholic hierarchy is perfectly content to have its Catholic laymen in New York prey and batten on vice and crime and immorality and thuggery, as well as on little business and big business from a peanut stand up to steamship companies, so long as the Church gets part of the swag. With your philosophy of all our troubles being due to class hatreds, you go out of your way to say that that fine public man, Mayor Mitchel, was turned down because he was known as a friend of the Vanderbilts. It is hard to believe that a publication edited in New York could make such a statement except for purpose of deceiving its readers. Mitchel was turned down by the Roman Catholic Church because he had exposed its corrupt methods of dealing with large appropriations which it received from the city for its charities. He was vilified and denounced from Roman Catholic pulpits by word and in pamphlets circulated in all the churches. One of his greatest vilifiers, apparently repudiated by the secretary of the Cardinal, who said that the offender spoke as a private citizen from his pulpit, was, however, rewarded by a degree of Doctor of Divinity by Fordham University, and the papers recorded that while others who were given honorary degrees were received "with applause" this particular priest received a "frantic ovation," supposedly for his virtue but really because he had abused Mitchel like a pickpocket. During the campaign the Catholic laity were stampeded in a body against Mitchel and it is known that he was privately subjected to all sorts of insults by Catholics, being put in a kind of coventry or what amounted to ostracism. For The New Republic not to know this, or if it does know it, to hide it, and to ignore the fact also that Walker and Texas Guinan as representative of Christian citizenship (Roman Catholic) seem to be the beau ideal of what Catholic laities should be, is to miss the whole heart of why Tammany survives and why New York today is not unlike Rome under the Borgias.

New York City. JOHN R. THORNTON.

Radio and the Three R's

SIR: As one who has played a somewhat humble part in education by radio, I wish to be permitted to add one fact to your mournful editorial of August 13 on the subject. Here, as everywhere, the typical reaction of the liberal critics is to blame our commercialism and to contrast us unfavorably with the culture of Europe. Far be it from me to defend commercialism. But I expect The New Republic to be more realistic. The highest arts must, and most of them have, made terms with it. I have never been impressed with the poverty of our artists and musicians. They have made terms with our commercial institutions and most of them have not suffered as a consequence.

Now it is a curious fact that educators who are always teaching the necessity of adjusting our lives to new facts have made so little use of this—one of the most important facts in the history of mankind—radio. Business, advertising, entertainment, politics and the musical arts have adjusted themselves to the new situation, but education is supinely waiting for something to happen. I submit that if education lags behind it is the fault, not of the broadcasting companies, but of educators and educational administrators. The broadcasting companies have shown a greater willingness to place their facilities at the disposal of educators than your editorial admits. Yet, as President Alderman, the chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education of the National Broadcasting Company, has said: "The greatest medium in communication ever offered for awakening and stimulating the people's interest in the arts and sciences is still largely unused."

The next move is clearly up to the educators. Have they the elasticity, the frankness and the courage to take advantage of the new opportunities? We can only urge them on.

New York City. GUSTAV PECK.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gothic Magnificence

Morgan the Magnificent, by John K. Winkler. New York: The Vanguard Press. 313 pages. $3.50.

MR. WINKLER has written a better book than his "Portrait in Oils" of John D. Rockefeller, partly because he has a better subject. The Standard Oil Company affords the best example of the growth and consolidation of an American industry, based upon the exploitation of natural resources, through the concentrated application of the powers of an individual devoted to a single end. The unification of the oil industry under the elder Rockefeller may be compared to the unification of Germany under Bismarck, to whose methods, including a resort to blood and iron, those of the American captain stand in fair comparison. The organization of American business by Morgan represents a greater and more varied enterprise, demanding a wider range of ability and occupying a larger and more spectacular stage. It is comparable to the European system of Napoleon, a truly imperial conception.

The successive steps of Morgan's rise to empire mark the divisions of Mr. Winkler's biography. His father, Junius Spencer Morgan, of the firm of George Peabody, in London, had become the leading dealer in American investments and foreign exchange. This position he transmitted to his son. It determined the history of the House of Morgan, as the protector of foreign investments in America and of American credit abroad, until the World War caused a reversal of the function. The younger Morgan, established in New York as the American agent of George Peabody and Company, which, on Peabody's retirement, became Junius S. Morgan and Company, learned his trade in the financial guerilla skirmishing which attended the Civil War. Mr. Winkler does not conceal his part in the speculations in gold, which embarrassed the government, or in the purchase of condemned carbines from the New York Arsenal for $3.50 apiece and their resale to General Frémont for $22, although he suggests that Morgan did not know how bad the muskets were. However, since later wars have demonstrated that to poison soldiers with embalmed beef, to expose sailors to death behind rotten armor plate, to burn up aviators in leaky airplanes is compatible with the highest patriotism, it is not worth while to dwell on this phase of Morgan's career, nor does Mr. Winkler do so. After the War Morgan took an active part in saving the Albany and Susquehanna Railroad from Jay Gould, so vividly told by the Adams brothers in their "Chapters of Erie." The firm, now Morgan, Drexel and Company, fought Jay Cooke for a half interest in the refunding operations undertaken by the government in 1873. Some years later, in the interest of foreign investors, Morgan entered the railway field to protect his clients against pirates of the Gould type. He forced peace between the giants of the Eastern field, the New York Central and the Pennsylvania, eliminated such disturbing factors as the West Shore, Nickel Plate and Southern Pennsylvania, and subdued the rebels such as Ives McLeod and Gates. Later he reorganized the railways of the South, of New England and of the Northwest, making good his control of the last in face of the most serious challenge that his power ever sustained, the raid by E. H. Harriman on the Northern Pacific. Of Morgan's failure, in connection with the New York, New Haven and Hartford, and of the searching investigation of his methods conducted by the present Justice Brandeis, Mr. Winkler, oddly enough, makes no mention.

The railroads furnished the first great opportunity for Morgan's genius. A second was offered by the growing industries, in organizing which he used the same combination of conciliation and menace which he had employed in the case of the railroads. United States Steel and International Harvester are his monuments in this field. But fundamental to the control of industry and transportation is finance, and in this department Morgan won at once the most spectacular and the most mysterious of his triumphs. To command the financial resources of the country, to dictate to the government itself, was Morgan's experience on two occasions—the first when he restored the gold reserve necessary to sustain the credit of the United States under Cleveland in 1893, by selling bonds for gold and guaranteeing that international bankers would leave it in the treasury; the second when he directed the operations of the combined New York banks in the panic of 1907. Mr. Winkler's phrase "Saving the Country," applied to Morgan's conduct on these occasions, is hardly an exaggeration. It is true that in saving the country Morgan was saving his clients, since the credit of the country was fundamental to the value of the securities which he had sold; and it is true that he exacted his price in various ways, as, for example, when he forced Roosevelt to acquiesce in the purchase of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company by the United States Steel Corporation; nevertheless, the splendor of the feat remains quite unsurpassed in the history of business. To Morgan's leadership, manifested most conspicuously on such occasions, may be ascribed the solidarity of American financial power, which in spite of internal rivalries and feuds, remains dominant in the control of the country and justifies us in describing our form of government as plutocracy.

Throughout this narrative Mr. Winkler gives us a lively portrait of his hero. Morgan was un-American in appearance, in manners, in methods and in interests. He looked like a Latin, like Crispi or Clemenceau. In manner he was dictatorial, brief, brusque and decisive, with nothing of the camaraderie of the Rotarian. His strength lay in rapid concentration of mind and imperturbable self-confidence; his weakness in impatience of detail. He was not a good trader in the Yankee sense. The Chicago men who sat in with him in the negotiations for the formation of the International Harvester Company were amazed at the looseness of his bargaining, but they admitted that no less dominating will could have forced them into agreement. Morgan loved the exercise of power; his was the genius of command. As a field captain he had the aplomb and resourcefulness of Marlborough, and the lines written by Addison on Blenheim might be adapted to Morgan's victory in the panic of 1907:

> 'Twas then great Morgan's mighty soul was proved,
> That in the shock of crashing banks unmoved,
> Amid confusion, horror and despair,
> Examined all the dreadful scenes of war;
> In peaceful thought the field of death surveyed,
> To bankrupt bankers sent he timely aid
> Inspired repulsed investors to engage,
> And taught the doubtful conflict where to rage.

Morgan loved power, and he loved pleasure. He surrounded himself with exquisite and rare things in every department of art and craft; he delighted in esthetic appeal of every sort, perfect food, fine wine, lovely mistresses. Mr. Winkler says that he thought of himself as a figure of the Renaissance, a despot and a connoisseur akin to Lorenzo de Medici. If he did, he was in error. Morgan was a despot but there was nothing of the Florentine's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finesse about his use of power; he was a patron of the arts, but his connoisseurship was second-hand and limited. He was, as Mr. Winkler says, "a check-book collector." In truth, he recalls an earlier period than the Renaissance, that in which the barbarians were just emerging into the light of Roman civilization. His religion serves to date him. Morgan's faith, like that of the Goths, was a superstitious belief that God would receive him washed clean of his sins by virtue of an atonement accomplished by the sacrifice of another, a creed to which he solemnly testified in the first paragraph of his will. Like the Goths also he had a kind of nostalgia for Rome, the eternal city, symbol of all that, amid the barbarous riot of luxury, he could never possess. He loved to be in Rome, although he seems to have made no effort to learn Italian. Mr. Winkler tells us that when his Roman coachman went to sleep on his box, he woke him by hurling fruit at him from the window of the Grand Hotel, a typical barbarian's antic. In Rome, as in Aix and other resorts, the inhabitants fawned upon him, and he liked to relax among them the martial dignity with which he held himself aloof in his own world. Morgan was magnificent, if Mr. Winkler likes, but less with the magnificence of Lorenzo de Medici than that of Theodoric the Ostrogoth.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

The Cycle of Lord Chelsea

Last and First Love, by Abel Hermant. Translated by Slater Brown. New York: The Macaulay Company. $2.

IN "LAST AND FIRST LOVE," the first of his many novels to be translated into English, Abel Hermant has written a most oblique satire on the characteristics and tone of the British aristocracy. Whether or not he has succeeded depends on the direction from which one approaches the book—which is called, in the original, "Le Cycle de Lord Chelsea." Erase the name of the author from the title page, substitute that of a good Anglo-Saxon, and one would say that the novel lacked either penetration or a decent candor, and that it was scarcely born of immersion in a material. But, knowing that it comes from a Gaul, the notion of relativity at once enters in to color one's view: we read, not to gain an understanding of the British smart set, but to learn what a Quai d'Orsai man who is also a member of the French Academy thinks of the British aristocrat. Hermant may be all wrong—one would be presumptuous to lay down the law in this matter from a point in the territory served by the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad—but international mistakes must be admitted into the category of very palpable realities.

The book has a slightly poisonous flavor. Chelsea himself, though living his orchidaceous life in the immediately post-war world that Aldous Huxley likes periodically to dip into his pot of black bile, bears a surface resemblance to Oscar Wilde. He is presented as the flower of an effeminate society. All his little strokes seem directed towards vaunting the feminine in man, the boyish in woman; and perhaps it is part of the satire that Chelsea's "last and first love" is a woman with a masculine tenacity of purpose and a love of independence that one might look for vainly in the womanly ideal of the Victorian epoch. The finale of the book, patterned somewhat after the Wilde-Queensberry trial, seems to clinch the allegorical nature of the story. The incidental dig would seem to be at the Saxon propensity for making a public barbecue of private morals. Every seven years, said Macaulay, English virtue becomes disgusting.

If "Last and First Love" is a parable, and if it rays back into reality, then the sooner Moscow conquers the better it will be for the British nation. For the Chelseas and the St. Albanses of this book aren't fit to rule, either as statesmen or as symbols. Perhaps M. Hermant has written of the final fall-off of the English aristocrat. In the eighteenth century the aristocrat was somebody: he either served as a patron, or was busy enclosing the common lands for the benefit of the British stomach. He was still somebody after Waterloo, when Britain was being changed by the young strides of the industrial revolution: coarse, loving sport and drink, he was at least virile. In Thackeray's day Lord Steyne at least fastened his eye upon Becky Sharp, and not upon an epicene Lord Verulam (as Lord Chelsea does, however innocently). But today, if "Last and First Love" be taken as representative, corruption has passed from the economic realm to that of personal relations. Commentators as diverse as Frank Harris and Robert Graves have whispered or openly alluded to moral havoc wrought by the Public School system, and in London one hears gossip that goes by the name of the New Frankness. If Abel Hermant has attempted, as the publishers indicate, to create an English equivalent of Proust's Baron de Charlus, one can grant him his theme. But one also wishes that he hadn't been so elusive about it, so subtle to the vanishing point. Some day we should like to ask him to come clean.

A word about the translation. The die-hards have so drummed it into us that splitting an infinitive is a major crime against the schoolmarm that we have come to act as if we believed it. Therefore, Mr. Brown is to be censured, more in sorrow than in anger, for not putting all his infinitives into marching order shoulder to shoulder. Otherwise (save for a couple of "the *hoi polloi*"'s) the translation is properly unobtrusive.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN.

Ford Was Right

The Great Crusade and After, a History of America Since 1914, by Preston William Slosson. New York: The Macmillan Company. 485 pages. $5.

AFTER ruminating over this 485-page effort to compact and organize the events and developments which have affected the United States since the first War year, I am impelled to confess that I cannot see what good it is. It is of no account as a chronicle because it operates with painstaking intensiveness in certain areas, and shies away, at the same time, from contact with several notably maverick facts. And it is useless as a source of information because in many an instance it finds room for statements at variance with the facts, where by nature no room exists.

Take Professor Slosson's treatment of the War, for an example. There is half a page devoted to a specious defense of the Y. M. C. A.—and not a crumb of notice for the Archangel campaign or the secret treaties, the Morgan loans or the malignantly bungled relations with the Soviet Union before the Versailles Treaty. Only once in the narrative is one given a hint of the American aggression against the Soviets, and this hint dances on thin air—an isolated oddity over the implications of which one may ponder in vain. The United States, it appears, not only kept an army in the field under the difficulties attending transatlantic shipment of supplies, but at one time successfully maintained in Siberia troops engaged in guarding railway lines against "hostile Russian bands." With Professor Slosson's book for reference, the next generation may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cerebrate from one May Day to the next without finding any plausible reason for the presence of American troops in Siberia, or any further clue to the identity of their opponents.

Perhaps the defense of the Y. M. C. A. is worth a line. Professor Slosson pleads that the resources of the organization were not large enough to permit its giving away its stock when it was operating the Army canteens. Thus, he manages to strike beside the point entirely, and to give a false impression at the same time. For no one expected Army stock to be handed out free. The soldier's case against the Y. M. C. A. as canteen operator rested on the prices charged, the hostile insistence on the letter of the rule and the generally antipathetic character of the personnel. And Professor Slosson omits to mention that the Y. M. C. A., relieved by the Army of canteen duty, began then to peddle refreshments of its own, and, what is worse, continued to harass the enlisted men with its strange mixture of Pollyanna, Strongfortism, Krafft-Ebing and Little Bethel.

When he comes to the Post-War Period, or Period of Redestruction, Professor Slosson is no more reliable. President Harding, he says, "in closer touch [than Congress] with the Treasury officials, opposed a general money grant to unwounded veterans"—thereby implying that Warren Gamaliel had economy at heart in his anti-bonus attitude. Muscle Shoals is referred to as a "white elephant from the federal menagerie," and the attempt to turn it over to private interests is guilelessly ascribed to a "revulsion from War socialism." It is, however, in the chapter entitled "The Saga of the Motor Car" that Professor Slosson shows his real worth as a student of contemporary life. Here, this associate professor of History at the University of Michigan is on his home ground, for the great educational factory which employs him is within easy reach of the greatest automotive manufacturing center in the world. Yet his discussion of recent developments in the automobile world is a succession of mistakes.

He informs his readers, for example, that there was "no sign of a satiated market" for the Model T when the Ford Motor Company shut down in 1927 to prepare for production of the new Model A. This is nothing less than direct defiance of the facts. Two stiff attempts had been made to maintain the Model T line in 1925 and 1926 respectively, and it was simply no go. Nothing that could be done to the old job could stem more than temporarily the rising tide of Chevrolet, and the danger signals had been in public view for at least a year. When the Professor says that "competition was keener," he is talking in quiet-sector terms of an outstanding big push into the Ford sales zone.

Nor is there a trace of truth in his statement that "as usual, the car itself was far less novel than the improvements in the methods of production." One can refute him in part by looking under the hood of a Model A and comparing the power plant with that of any other American car. For the rest, add the fact that some 400 parts of the Model A, formed in the majority of cars of cast, rolled and riveted metal, are composed of forged and pressed steel, built into integrated units by the flash-welding process. Naturally it was necessary to develop novel machines for the production of these novelly designed parts, but what happened to production methods was change rather than improvement.

Another of Professor Slosson's statements is that, "needing rolling stock for hauling materials, he [Ford] took over the decrepit Detroit, Toledo and Ironton Railway. . . . " Which is to say that in order to obtain railroad cars, Mr. Ford bought complete a railroad which was equipped only with antiquated ones, so badly run down that many had to be scrapped. Even taking the term "rolling stock" to mean what it doesn't, the statement remains faulty. I cannot see why Professor Slosson did not take the logical and obvious view of the matter and say that the railroad was purchased as a line of transportation between the Ford coal fields and the River Rouge plant. Other than coal, what material can be brought from the zone served by the road? None, as far as I can see, at least until Mr. Ford's Kentucky timberlands are made accessible for exploitation.

Finally the professor tells us, "He [Ford] even branched out into aviation, turning his attention to the possibility of a cheap and practical airplane." When one considers that it is now five years since Mr. Ford turned his attention to this possibility, and that the Ford plane of today sells for not less than $25,000 in its lowest-priced form, and that it is practical only when an experienced pilot is at the controls. . . . Well, I choose to say only that if this is history, Mr. Ford was right.

MURRAY GODWIN.

A New History of Science

A History of Science, by William Cecil Dampier Dampier-Whetham. New York: The Macmillan Company. 514 pages. $5.

IT IS obvious that a good history of science must contain more than a bare collection of facts. It must be, first of all, a complete outline of scientific thought which will furnish the experimentalist with the historical background of his restricted researches. It must provide the layman and the student of culture with a story of the development of the sciences that will illustrate their interrelations with the history of ideas and the evolution of civilization in general. In short, it must be a possible basis for a philosophy of science. The present book, from this point of view, is a good deal of a failure. The author is not only a chemist of repute in the fields of colloids and solutions, but has published a number of books and monographs on the history of science and related subjects. But, notwithstanding his splendid background and intentions, his latest work suffers from a distortion of historical perspective, from a misplacement of emphasis and from a reactionary social attitude which prejudices its outlook.

The bulk of the book is devoted to modern science. This means that the importance of Greek and medieval science for civilization is entirely lost. For, if science is "systematized positive knowledge," a cumulative and progressive synthesis of facts, it is primarily due to the speculations of the early Greek nature philosophers and the experimental and analytical studies of the Hellenistic scientists. And further, since the entire advance of science has been dependent upon the development of mathematical concepts and techniques, what would have been the state of modern science if we were still using Roman numerals; if we were unaware of the concept of zero, or if medieval Oriental mathematicians had not exported to Europe a system of decimals, algebra and Hindu numerals?

Far too much emphasis is placed upon the exact sciences; indeed, the work must be regarded as a physical scientist's conception of the history of science. No other explanation can account for the hopelessly inadequate treatment of mathematics, medicine and, in particular, the biological sciences, the nineteenth-century developments of which are crowded into forty confused and disheveled pages.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Progressive Education

A liberal, humanitarian magazine for the modern educator and parent, reflecting the new tendencies in education and life.

Contents for November

WHAT SHOULD COLLEGE STUDENTS LEARN?
Dr. Goodwin Watson

VI: EMERSON, A PROPHET IN EDUCATION
J. Milnor Dorey

EARTH SCIENCES AND CHILDREN
Bertha Stevens

THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE, A LOWER SCHOOL PROBLEM
Helen Ethen Cuttler

A CRITIQUE OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS
George A. Boyce

FLAMME EMPOR
Marion B. Burling

RHYTHM IN TERMS OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION
Jacques Dalcroze

Editorial *News and Comments* *Recent Books*
News of the Association *In the Magazines*
Among the New Books for Boys and Girls

Published eight times monthly during the school year by *The Progressive Education Association,* 10 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. *Ann Shumaker,* Editor; *Dr. W. Carson Ryan,* Advisory Editor.

Each subscription includes membership in the Association, with its professional services for school and home problems, aid in securing positions and locating schools.

Progressive Education Association,
10 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
Dept. O

Date.....

Enclosed find my check for $3.00 for which enter my subscription to *Progressive Education* for one year, beginning with the October, 1930, issue, entitling me to membership in the Progressive Education Association.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

SPECIAL OFFER: With each subscription entered this month, two reprints will be included free. Send for checking list. Send for clubbing rates with other magazines and books on education.

Mr. Dampier-Whetham's account of the influence of science upon modern thought, in contrast to his meager treatment of other subjects, is full and vivid. But, like Professor Eddington, he makes too much of the breakdown of what he always calls "crude" materialism. There is no reason why materialism as a philosophy is any cruder than any other monistic explanation of the universe. Furthermore, a neo-materialistic philosophy can be erected upon the current belief that a disturbance in an atomic area represents the probable presence of an electron, just as well as upon the older belief that the universe was composed of "cold lumps" of dead matter. The fact that the ultimate particles of matter have turned out to be mere sources for the absorption and emission of radiation does not in itself destroy the materialistic hypothesis as a possible interpretation of the universe.

Formerly, science believed that its ultimate goal was the discovery and explanation of reality. There was built up, in accordance with this belief, a mechanical model which, in the knowledge of the time, satisfactorily explained the universe in terms of discrete bits of matter. At present, science is aware that its former goal was a futile one: that it is impossible to subject reality to reason. The great cornerstone of science, the supposed uniformity of nature, is now seen to be an abstraction, useful only as a tool which simplifies nature's complexities. Strict causality, another cornerstone of science, failed to hold true in the microscopic world of the atom and is now regarded as a mental device for dealing with complex data. Since Poincaré's demonstration that any collection of physical aggregates can be subjected to an infinite number of mechanical explanations, the major hypothesis of science—the explanation of the universe in mechanical terms—has degenerated into mere description. The quest for reality, therefore, has been abandoned as impossible and meaningless. Scientists are now content with convenient and simple hypotheses that approximate reality, but can never explain it.

The transcendent nature of reality has furnished a cue for mystical scientists to escape into the supra-mundane. They have substituted private quests for God for the older corporate quest for truth. Their attitude threatens the whole conceptual structure of science. In order to progress, science must begin in experience and end in experience. Any suggestion that the nature of the universe is to be sought in some extra-experiential process begs the question, since it makes the whole problem of science an insoluble one from the very start. HYMAN ROSEN.

"God Help Me to Be Better"

No Bed of Roses, by O. W. New York: The Macaulay Company. $2.

TO READ this diary of a prostitute and doper is very much like standing at a street corner staring down at something horribly dead under a strip of canvas. By this I do not mean that the fascination which it exerts over the reader is preëminently a morbid one. The process of human dissolution which this prostitute almost blithely records is so inevitable, the virus of corruption which slowly and inevitably corrodes her heart and mind is so manifestly a product of her own dark interior self, that the book achieves in a strange and terrifying manner the organic unity and progression of real art.

The diary begins in a commonplace way and tells a story not much different from that of any number of country girls who come to a great city and go wrong. But O. W.'s

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

downfall is not caused fundamentally by weakness. For though it is true that she is a soft slob who can resist no temptation, her decline is caused not so much by weakness as by a fascination, almost a passion, for vice.

Curiously enough, this fascination which eventually consumes her does not find its expression until O. W. first falls in love with a man who symbolizes to her all the manly and civilized virtues of her world. The awakening of love seems at the same time to awaken her passion for vice and to cleave her character into two discrete and self-destructive parts. From then on we watch this passion slowly and inevitably devour her passion for her man. We watch her sink gradually from the swank call houses of Park Avenue to the black-and-tan cribhouses of Baltimore. We watch her hustling small-town hotels in South Carolina, bribing hotel dicks and bellhops to bring her men, filling herself up to the eyes with junk to carry her through the long white nights; we see her sewing on aprons (God knows why) as she waits for clucks to come to her hotel bedroom. We watch her half-hearted struggles against dope, and her whole-hearted struggles to get it, we watch her cheating, screaming, begging for a bang of cocaine, raving and vomiting when she can find no junkie who will trust her for it. We see her during the nights of savage loneliness in the sleepless hall rooms of Forty-seventh Street, we see her abandoned by her friends ("When people in Greenwich Village refuse to bother with you, surely no one else will") and forced to consort with people whom she despises, with whom she has nothing in common except a craving for junk. We see her in jail, in sanitariums, until we finally see her blackmailing her "heart," and, in a last burst of insanity, being dragged raving to Bellevue.

It is a moving and horrible book, intensified by a style which, except at those rare intervals when the compiler of the diary feels it necessary to touch it up with a few tabloid colors, or, in other words, to hold The Daily Mirror up to nature, is devoid of all literary pretensions. But it has progression, development. From the chattery, girlish style of the first few pages it passes to the staccato, hysterical "I must stop this racket. It is killing me by inches. I'm a nervous wreck and full of dope all the time. I must set a definite time to sleep, and see that I stick to it. I shall have to tell my men that it will be impossible for me to keep going until six or seven in the morning." It is on such a note that the book ends, a note of ghastly, almost inhuman despair: "Tonight is New Year's Eve and I must be strong. I shall have to take my last fill of dope, for I am booked solid for the night. I do not know how I shall be equal to it. I am deathly sick and worried. God help me to be better."

SLATER BROWN.

A Mistress of Vision

White April, by Lizette Woodworth Reese. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 67 pages. $1.50.

IN THESE fifty-three new poems Miss Reese does more than defend her claims as a lyrist of secure, if restricted, quality. She provides an explanation of her rare and long sustained lyric vitality. Hitherto she has been admired either as a poet of old-fashioned sentiment or as a survivor of Victorian conventions. On neither score does she require the concession of the critic, and neither side of the contrast which her verse bridges supplies the clue to her fundamental merit. This springs from the integrity of her conception of experience and ensures her art against the enfeebling boldness that undermines the lyric talent of most women who try to master their environment.

MOTION PICTURES

The Talking Picture That
Has Caused All The Talking

OUTWARD BOUND

WARNER BROS.
HOLLYWOOD THEATRE
Broadway at 51st Street
Twice Daily: 2:45—8:45
Good Seats: 50c, 75c, $1.00

"WHITE HELL OF PITZ PALU"

Great *Silent* Motion Picture! Countless Thrills, Surpassing Beauty in a Tremendous Drama of Puny Humans Pitting Their Feeble Strength Against Relentless Nature. Nothing like it ever filmed before!

BEGINS WED. OCT. 15.— LITTLE CARNEGIE PLAY HOUSE, 146 W. 57th St.

THEATRES

ARTHUR HOPKINS presents
TORCH SONG
A new drama by KENYON NICHOLSON
"The most noteworthy offering of the new season. As I left the theatre they were standing in the aisles cheering."
—ROBERT GARLAND, *Telegram.*
PLYMOUTH THEA., 45th St., W. of Broadway. Eves. 8:40. Mats. Thursday & Saturday, 2:30.

Aristocrat of All Revues!
THE SECOND **LITTLE SHOW**
with AL TRAHAN—MARION HARRIS—JAY C. FLIPPEN
Best seats, $1 to $4.40. On sale for 8 weeks. Pop. Mat. Thurs. $1 to $3
ROYALE THEATRE 45th St., W. of Broadway. Evs. 8.30 Mat. Thursday and Saturday, 2.30.

LECTURES

American Civilization Today

A Symposium on the Technological Revolution of Our Time and its Social Effects planned by
Prof. CHARLES A. BEARD
Mondays, 8:30 p. m., beginning Oct. 20

LECTURERS:

Stuart Chase	Parker T. Moon
Leo Wolman	Lewis Mumford
Louis Waldman	George S. Counts
Norman Thomas	Carl Van Doren
Rexford G. Tugwell	Wm. P. Montague
Harry W. Laidler	Raymond C. Moley
Wesley C. Mitchell	John Dewey
John A. Fitch	Harry F. Ward
James T. Shotwell	Morris R. Cohen

Morris Hillquit

Special Course Fee — Single Admissions
HEYWOOD BROUN — Mon., Oct. 13, 8:30
"The Theatre and Life"

Other courses:

Philosophy	Psychology
Literature	Music
Sociology	Art
Economics	Labor Problems, etc.

Write, phone or call for further information

Rand School of Social Science
7 East 15th Street Algonquin 3094

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If her contemporaries of forty years ago fell prey to an excess of inhibited feeling, fully as many members of the generation which Miss Reese still lives to challenge have become victims of their ill conceived extraversion. I presume that Miss Sitwell spoke with special authority, as well as unexpected sobriety, when she recently analyzed the defect in contemporary women's verse while reviewing Charlotte Mew's poems for The Criterion (October, 1929). "As a rule women give the impression in their poems of envisaging some emotion from the outside, and then of themselves, heroic figures, larger than life and far more perfectly formed than any human being could hope to be, in the grip of these emotions, and surrounded by a large, admiring and sympathetic crowd. There is a general lack of restraint, decency and dignity to be observed." From this charge Miss Reese's poems escape through their unerring emotional honesty and the candor whereby it is expressed. If she loses the logical precision and grasp of the highest lyrists, it is because she trusts too much to the mere enthusiasm of her feelings to propel her toward their full expression.

The tough fiber of beauty that persists in "White April" is woven of Miss Reese's shrewd and tenacious sense of life. "A Victorian Village," her autobiography, showed her extraordinary grasp of the social and spiritual changes she has witnessed in the patrician South. Apart from their literary value, her poems will remain in our literature as an index of the means whereby those changes were challenged and their ruinous effects opposed. This insight informs with subtle divination the work of a mind which is neither ingenious enough to accept the infinite with Mme. de Noailles and Mrs. Meynell, or courageous enough to explore it with Emily Brontë and Emily Dickinson. Miss Reese is conscious of the upper air, but it remains for her a safe extension of the bracing atmosphere she breathes. She is content to praise a living world whose changes she has watched without dismay and in whose richness of experience she has never lost faith. But unlike the average lyric optimism, her praise is marked by an authority that lends its virtue to her simple and distinguished art.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL.

Notes on Novels

Angel Pavement, by J. B. Priestley. New York: Harper and Brothers. $3.

IN "ANGEL PAVEMENT" Mr. Priestley has written a better book than "The Good Companions"—firmer, neater, harder. In theme and structure it is entirely modern. A group of clerks, salesmen, stenographers and the like are held together by Twigg and Dersingham, a decaying business concern, in Angel Pavement, into which comes a buccaneer bringing sudden prosperity followed by ruin. Mr. Priestley follows Dersingham and each of the employees—Mr. Smeeth the bookkeeper, Turgis the shipping clerk, Miss Matfield the stenographer—into their colorless lives suddenly irradiated by Golspie and his piratical daughter Lena, only to be plunged from drabness into blackness by his departure. In manner, however, as in "The Good Companions," Mr. Priestley reverts to the old habit of the English novel, of unlimited communication with the reader about his characters, detailed description of their appearance, copious report of their speech, free entrance into their dull minds. Mr. Priestley has two gifts of the older craftsmen, abundance and vivacity. His reviewers do him no service, however, in comparing him with Dickens. He belongs to a tradition which Dickens found already established by Fielding and Smollett, and in which he imitated freely his immediate predecessors, Pierce Egan and Robert Surtees. Mr. Priestley has as good right to the characteristic English methods of fiction as ever Dickens had.

The only illuminating comparison between him and his predecessors is in the matter of atmosphere. Dickens and Thackeray and Trollope wrote of England in the morning sunlight; they were cheerful writers and aimed to give their public the pleasures of hope. In their novels tragedy only sharpened the novel reader's appetite for the good life of fiction. Mr. Priestley writes as evening shadows and storm clouds are falling over London. What joy there is in creature comforts, always so abundant in native English fiction, is supplied by the alien Mr. Golspie, who brings back for his companions for a moment the rare roast of beef, cigars and double whiskeys, and adds a few exotic liqueurs. For the most part, however, food, cigarettes, cocktails and sex afford only momentary relief or stimulus to jaded nerves, followed by deeper gloom. Without attributing too much symbolism to the story, it is enough to say that Mr. Priestley has used the old English manner, associated inseparably with what we call healthy fiction, to emphasize the decay of English life.

R. M. L.

The Patriot's Progress, by Henry Williamson. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $2.50.

THIS BOOK is less fiction than a precise document affording a composite picture of the War as nine-tenths of the participants must have seen it. John Bullock, the hero, is neither sensitive nor intelligent, nor in any other way distinguished from his millions of prototypes. One could read out the rosters of entire regiments, and he could rightfully answer to every name. Yet, in spite of his allegorical personality, he is completely human. He volunteers early, spends a year or so in training camps, goes into action, loses a leg and comes home. "It hadn't been such a bad time, taken all around: he wouldn't have missed it, really." In a statement quoted on the jacket, Arnold Bennett hails the book as "a tremendous, an overwhelming, an unanswerable indictment of the institution of war"; but that is not Mr. Williamson's fault. In this clear objective picture, the author has no more thought of indicting war than a biologist has of giving his bacteria a sound spanking.

R. G.

Contributors

MATHEW O. TOBRINER is a San Francisco lawyer and the author, with E. G. Mears, of "Principles and Practice of Coöperative Marketing."

VERA MICHELES DEAN is on the research staff of the Foreign Policy Association, where her special territory is that of Russian affairs.

JOSEPH MCGOLDRICK is a member of the department of Public Law at Columbia University and a member of the New York bar.

LYLE W. COOPER is professor of Economics at Marquette University and contributes articles to economics journals.

VINCENT SHEEAN is the author of "Gog and Magog," a new novel just published by Harcourt, Brace.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN of The New York Times Book Review is at work on a book of essays.

MURRAY GODWIN, formerly editor of Science and Invention, was a contributor to Transition.

HYMAN ROSEN is a mathematical physicist who contributes to scientific journals.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL is professor of English at Loyola University and associate editor of Poetry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED